

Vol. V.

JANUARY, 1884.

No. 1.

THE  
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN  
REVIEW.



REV. W. C. LOGAN, EDITOR.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:

REV. S. G. BURNEY, D.D.,

REV. A. B. MILLER, D.D.,

REV. A. J. McGLUMPHY, D.D.

First Series, Vol. xx.

Second Series, Vol. xv.

Entered at the Postoffice at ST. LOUIS, MO., as Second Class matter.

## CONTENTS.

---

I.—A TEMPERANCE QUESTION FOR THE CHURCHES OF AMERICA, REV. GEO. H. HUBBARD, Hartford, Conn.,	1
II.—THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION, I., REV. F. R. EARLE, D.D., Boonsboro, Ark., . . . . .	19
III.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF JOB, REV. S. R. CHADICK, McKinney, Texas, . . . . .	36
IV.—THE GENESIS IN LUTHER OF THE REFORMATION PRINCIPLE, REV. W. H. BLACK, St. Louis, Mo., . .	55
V.—HEATHEN AND CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY, REV. W. P. BONE, Henderson, Texas, . . . . .	71
VI.—HEBREW ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, I., H. M. IRWIN, Charlotte, N. C., . . . . .	81
VII.—EDITORIAL, . . . . .	93
VIII.—LITERARY NOTICES: Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians; Ecce Coelum, or Parish Astronomy; A Critique of Design-Arguments; &c., . . . . .	95
IX.—GENERAL NOTES: The Interpretation of Scripture; Experience; Commentaries; The First Sin; Doctrinal Preaching; The Lord's Supper and the Atonement; Eutaxiology, 100	







*B. F. Burckhead*

# THE REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1884.

## A TEMPERANCE QUESTION FOR THE CHURCHES OF AMERICA.

WHY ought the Church of Christ to abandon the practice of using fermented wine at the Communion of the Lord's Supper?

Many a worthy cause has been ruined by the mistakes of its most ardent defenders. A good principle often fails to meet with acceptance in the public mind because it is wrongly presented. The most evident truth is sometimes connected with that which is weak, or from its nature unacceptable, or it is supported by false arguments; and when the weakness of these supports is discovered, the entire structure is accredited with weakness, because it is supposed by those who examine it only superficially to rest on these arguments alone. An error which frequently entraps even scholarly minds is the temptation to waste time and strength on points of minor importance, which are easily developed in the train of any great truth, to the total obscuring of the main question. It is as though Samson had tried to destroy the Philistines by tugging away at a number of small pillars in some external porch or balcony of the temple of Dagon, instead of bowing with all his strength on the two central columns upon which the entire roof rested. A principle may be so strong in itself as almost to nullify the possibility of

dispute, yet some over-zealous supporter of the principle, by building flimsy abutments about that which is of itself a pyramid of stability, may bring into prominent notice connected subjects that are easily and endlessly debatable; and these, usurping the place of the real point at issue, make it appear of doubtful strength. The less crowds out and conceals the greater; and the greater, in many minds, stands or falls with the less.

No question has suffered more severely at the hands of mistaken friends than has the temperance question. Few questions of such vital and universal importance afford so many tempting by-paths to the careless Rambler; hence many persons, who might be enlisted as active supporters of the temperance cause if it were fairly presented to them and urged by sound reasoning and common-sense, are wholly alienated by the false and fanatical arguments used to persuade them. So, too, the particular phase of the temperance question presented in the title of this article, the question of sacramental wine, has been obscured in the popular mind and rendered unpalatable to thorough scholars by confusing it with discussions about "*tiros*h," "*yayin*," "*oinos*," "Passover wine," and other topics of a similar nature. All these subjects naturally arise in the same connection, and they abundantly gratify a love of research and debate; yet they are by no means essential components of the main question. That may be and ought to be decided independently of them. It would doubtless afford great satisfaction to all who abhor alcohol if we could prove that two kinds of wine are spoken of in the Bible, intoxicating wine as a curse, and unintoxicating wine as a blessing; also if it could be shown that Christ never used fermented liquors, but that all the wine made and used by him was non-alco-

holic; but these questions certainly *have not* yet been decided, and it is not at all certain that they ever will be. Investigation in these directions, however, is very enticing, and scholars have allowed themselves to be drawn into the discussion until they have come to look upon this as the chief battle ground of the war, and to feel that if they can decide as to what kind of wine was used among the early Hebrews, they will by the same argument decide what kind of wine the church should use to-day. Thus a writer in one of our recent reviews, at the close of an extended argument designed to prove that no such thing as unfermented wine is or ever was known in Palestine, that modern Jews at the Passover use fermented wine and that the early Christian church did the same, towards the conclusion of his paper writes as follows: "We can never consent to an impeachment of the morality of the New Testament, or to a disfiguration or mutilation of the blessed sacrament of the Supper in the supposed interests of temperance." At one and the same stroke he would dispose of all these questions as if they were but one, or were mutually dependent; and he is but a fair example of many on either side, whose views of the question in hand appear to be governed by a similar idea. Such conclusions, however, cannot logically be deduced from the given line of argument. They arise from a confusion of totally distinct subjects, and to rest our views of the communion wine question solely upon arguments of this kind is to shoot wide of the mark.

The question as to whether the Church of to-day ought or ought not to use fermented wine at the Lord's Supper, like the temperance question at large, is not a question of critical scholarship, to be decided by lexicon and grammar, or the study of Hebrew roots and Assyr-

iology. It is a question of Christian ethics, to be settled by practising the broad rules of Christian love. It has to do with American society of to-day, and not with Palestinian Jews of the time of our Savior. Christ lived in a country where water was comparatively scarce and of poor quality, and in an age when distilled liquors were unknown. With us everything is different. Our land is abundantly supplied with lakes, streams and springs. Pure water flows down every hill-side and gushes out in every valley. In Palestine the vine grows luxuriantly and grapes form one of the staple products of the land; but in America it is nearly impossible to obtain real wine, because of the quantities of distilled liquors by which it is counterfeited. We have, therefore, in our interpretation of Christ's commands in their application to our Christian life to take into the account the changed circumstances in the midst of which we live: we must remember that this is the nineteenth century, not the first; and that we live not in Palestine, but in America.

For nearly nineteen centuries the custom of using fermented wine at the Lord's Supper has existed, and from venerable age it has obtained so strong a hold on the minds of Christians that it has come to be considered an essential part of the sacrament. Many a Christian, who never drinks alcoholic liquor at other times, and who is in all other points an ardent supporter of total abstinence, still clings with affection to this old custom, and esteems it little less than sacrilege to talk of changing what has been so long established by substituting in the place of alcoholic wine some unintoxicating beverage. On the other hand, the conviction is steadily growing upon thoughtful Christians that there are evils connected with the custom, and that some

change ought to be made. It is high time, therefore, that the discussion of all side issues of the subject be laid aside, and that the question should be considered in its proper form and decided on its own merits.

*Why ought the Christian churches of America, at the present day, to abandon the use of fermented wine at the Communion of the Lord's Supper?* This is the question just as it ought to be presented to every American Christian to-day, stripped of all the network of minor questions by which it is so often concealed from view. To the question put in this form the answer is a simple one. The custom ought to be abandoned because, in this land, it is attended with great and undeniable evils. In the second place, these evils are incurred unnecessarily, and hence ought to be avoided. To illustrate and prove these two propositions is my present task.

Among the evils arising from the custom of using fermented wine, I urge first, the general point made against the unnecessary use of intoxicating liquors under any circumstances (for I hope in the course of this paper to prove that the use of wine at the Communion is unnecessary), viz., *that it is a hinderance to the temperance cause, inasmuch as it tends to support and encourage the liquor traffic.*

It is unnecessary for me to dwell at length upon the ravages of intemperance in our land, nor need I quote the denunciations of the Scriptures upon the drunkard. Every intelligent person of the present day is familiar with these facts. I therefore assume that drunkenness is a *sin* whose end is eternal death, and that this sin is exerting a wide-spread influence. Further than this, it is a sin which allures not only men of wholly depraved character; it has even entered the doors of our churches

and proved a fatal snare to many otherwise hopeful Christians. In this state of affairs it has come to pass that among places fruitful of temptation the liquor store takes a prominent place. Hence whatever supports or gives encouragement to the existence of a liquor store places temptation in the way of young men. The church that uses fermented wine must regularly patronize a liquor store, and the dealer who sells intoxicating wine to the good deacon cannot be blamed if he supplies the same commodity to less devout customers; at any rate he will be very likely to do so. Thus, by the unnecessary purchase of intoxicating wine, the liquor traffic is encouraged and the temperance cause is materially hindered in its progress. To say that the churches always patronize drug stores or other similarly respectable establishments does not invalidate the argument; for in a certain New England city where there are thirty drug stores, four only have druggist's liquor licenses, the rest having obtained the regular liquor dealer's license. And this state of things is likely to continue so long as it is lawful to sell liquor for any other than medicinal purposes.

Secondly. *In the practice of using fermented wine at the Communion the church lays herself open to the grave charge of inconsistency.* Christians who are strenuously endeavoring to abolish the liquor traffic, and ministers who preach against it from the pulpit, unite in supporting the very business which they denounce as a curse to the community. Those who brand alcohol as a poison and strictly banish every form of it from their family tables, insist that it shall be retained as the only beverage befitting the Lord's table. What they would withhold, as an element of evil, from the secular festivals of the worldly, they account indispen-



sable and an element of good at the Christian's sacred feast. The very lips that utter the "woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink," pronounce a blessing as the same drink is given to many neighbors in the flock of Christ. These are inconsistencies which one finds great difficulty in explaining. It is not sufficient to say that their parallel is found in the Scriptures, which speak in one place of wine as a mocker, and at another declare *the same* wine to be a blessing; for while that question is still in dispute, no matter how feebly, it forms no satisfactory foundation for an argument. By adhering to these inconsistencies the Church gives great occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme.

In the third place, *the use of fermented wine at the Communion is a source of fearful temptation to many who partake of it, especially to such as are reformed drunkards, and its use causes weak brethren to stumble.* It is a well attested fact that the man who has once fallen completely under the power of the appetite for strong drink can never again become a moderate drinker. The numberless attempts in this direction that have resulted in miserable failure have proved to demonstration that, outside the Church at least, there is no middle course for the reformed drunkard between total abstinence and irretrievable ruin. But when we come within the Church do we find a wholly different state of affairs? Has some mysterious factor been introduced here which entirely removes the temptation? In answer to this question I cite the following *facts*:

One gentleman of my acquaintance, a reformed and converted drunkard, told me of the severe struggle which he was obliged to undergo after his first Communion, caused by the mere odor of the wine which he did not taste; a struggle with the old appetite which so

affected him that in the space of six years he has not dared again to attend the Communion service. Another acquaintance, who had experienced a similar history, said that the recollection of his first Communion was a source of temptation to him for several weeks. I know a church where fermented wine is used, that recently numbered among its members six persons who, by reason of their weakness in this respect, were deprived of the Communion privilege.

But the deprivation of Christian fellowship is not the greatest evil that this custom entails upon weak brethren. A trustworthy friend told me of a young man, a reformed drunkard, who, after eight years of abstinence, was fatally ensnared by the wine at his first Communion. Another friend spoke of three similar cases which had come under her observation. The first was that of a young man who fell in the same way as the one last mentioned after seventeen months previous abstinence; the second of a person who had never tasted intoxicating liquor till he drank it at the Communion, but who, either from inherited taste or from constitutional weakness, was led to a drunkard's fate by the *cup* of the Lord's supper; the third, of one who, though a sober and consistent Christian during the intervals, had periods of drunkenness after each recurring Communion.

It is to be noted that these are not sensational stories, gathered at random and of doubtful authenticity. They are all well attested cases, matters of personal acquaintance, and they have been obtained with very little inquiry, as such cases are not rare enough to necessitate extended search in order to discover them.

*These are great evils.* Their importance is sufficient to demand the attention of every earnest Christian.



No one who truly appreciates the influence of the Church of Christ upon the temperance cause, or who is desirous that she should stand before the world in an unclouded light, no one in whom is the spirit of true Christian love for those of his fellow men who are weak at this particular point, can treat such facts lightly; much less can he wholly neglect them. *They are of universal application.* It would be difficult for any church of considerable size to say with positive certainty that there were no persons in its communion who were liable to temptation in drinking alcoholic wine. And if there were such a fortunate church, the other reasons which I have mentioned are of sufficient weight to call for its attention.

But such a statement of the evils arising from the use of intoxicating wine fails of its proper effect with many Christians, because they believe that in adhering to the established custom they are but fulfilling the command of Christ. The mere idea of a change is rejected with a feeling almost of horror. It seems to them little less than sacrilege to suggest that water or unfermented grape juice would answer every purpose, and ought to come into common use. And this feeling is not an unnatural one, when we consider the length of time during which the custom has been establishing itself. The fact that the custom is a venerable one throws a heavy burden of proof upon those who plead for a change; yet even long establishment does not make the custom binding or preclude the possibility of improvement. Nor again does its age prove its divine authority. That question must be decided by direct reference to the words of Christ.

This is, therefore, the second principal point which I propose to discuss: *Does the custom of using ferment-*

*ed wine rest upon Christ's commands?* If any one can prove that the use of fermented wine at the Lord's Supper is sanctioned by the divine command, then we cannot gainsay it, whatever the temptation or other apparent evil accompanying; for in the fulfillment of his commands Christ has promised all needed strength against temptation, and to draw back from obedience is to display a lack of faith in the promises and power of our Redeemer. In the attempts that have been made to answer this question, much time and force have been expended in discussing the *example* of Christ, and in striving to ascertain the substance used by him at the institution of the Supper. Scholars have argued the question warmly on either side, with little result so far as its final settlement is concerned. Perhaps, however, the discussion has not been a wholly fruitless one; for this point ought to be granted to them, viz., in view of the fact that there is a division of scholars on the subject and firm conviction on each side, no fair-minded Christian of to-day can, without investigation, accept it as a foregone conclusion that in using fermented wine he is sustained by the example of Christ. Yet, after all that has been said and written, this point, which has been so highly magnified, is really of slight comparative importance. By dwelling at such length upon the material originally used, we place the emphasis just exactly where our Lord and the inspired writers did not place it, and by this means many have been led to accept erroneous views of the entire subject. I propose, therefore, in the present discussion to pass over this minor point, granting to the sticklers for fermented wine all the weight that it may add to their arguments, and to enter directly upon the consideration of more important questions.

The following are the four passages of Scripture which recount the events at the institution of the Lord's Supper. Matt. xxvi. 26-30: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed. and brake it; and he gave to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Mark xiv. 22-26: "And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Luke xxii. 17-21: "And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you." I. Cor. xi. 23-27: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This

is my body, which is for you ; this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood : this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

A comparison of these passages discloses the following facts :

The word "*wine*" is not used in a single instance in connection with the Supper. In all of the four passages the word "*cup*" is used, and in three of them there is the more definite expression, "*the fruit of the vine*." Here we have four independent writers recording with considerable variations the words of Christ. They are men differing very greatly in their modes of life and in their habits of thought and speech ; and we believe that, while inspired by the Holy Spirit, they used language with natural freedom. Thirteen distinct times they are called upon to use a word descriptive of the drink used at the Communion service, seven times in loose quotation and six times with perfect independence. For all these cases they confine themselves to two expressions, and not once does either of them use the word "*wine*," which would certainly be a natural term, if not *the most* natural, if wine were what is meant. It may be said that the word "*cup*" was a technical term used by the Jews in connection with the Passover, and hence would rise more naturally to the minds of the writers than any other. But the evangelist Luke was not a Jew, and therefore would not be familiar with their technical terms, yet he uses precisely the same terms that the other writers use. What is the simplest inference from these facts? They cannot reasonably be adduced as evidence that our Lord used fermented wine at the

Supper, nor do they by any means prove the contrary. Supporters of either view have vainly endeavored to torture them into becoming favorable witnesses; but of themselves they do not add a feather's weight to either arm of that troublesome balance, and they can only be made to do so by the application of purely subjective reasoning. But there is an important inference which we can unquestionably derive from them. *If fermented wine was the substance actually used by our Savior, the inspired writers, by their use of language, remove all emphasis from it.*

The second step in the interpretation of Christ's command consists in an enquiry as to the meaning and purpose underlying the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. These, also, must be learned from a consideration of the words and acts of him who ordained the Supper.

The little Christian family is seated about the table on the evening of the Passover feast. Without introducing any new elements, our Lord makes use of the materials immediately before him, the simple appointments of the Supper, as emblems of his sufferings and death, saying, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." He enjoins the perpetual observance of a sacred *supper*, to keep his disciples in remembrance of his death. There is no significance in the particular materials, and, as we have already seen, no emphasis is laid upon them. It was the consecration of the *ordinary articles of daily food* as symbols of the spiritual food of the soul. This is emphatically true of the wine, which, whether fermented or not, was the wine in common use at other than Passover meals. Christ himself thus interprets the symbolism in John vi. 55: "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."

The two general classes of *food* and *drink* comprise all that is necessary for the sustenance and growth of the physical system; so Christ in his fulness furnishes all that is necessary for the spiritual life. This, then, is the meaning of our sacramental symbols. They are only *representative articles of food and drink*; nothing more. In this view, is it not inconsistent to select as the representative beverage that which we reject entirely from our list of beverages at all other times?

But it may be urged that at the institution of the Supper Christ introduced an idea not contained in the words quoted from John's Gospel. Just previous to the Supper the Savior had compared himself to a vine, and some one will say in selecting the symbols he retained in his mind the thought of that comparison; hence there is a peculiar fitness in the use of wine as the product of the vine. Of any who hold this view I ask, In what element of the wine does the symbolism lie? In the alcohol? No one would go so far as to say that, yet it is the legitimate conclusion to be derived from premises which contain this argument in support of fermented wine; and it is this idea that leads so many Christians to prefer the most doubtful of fermented compounds to unfermented grape juice. Alcohol, as such, is no part of the fruit of the vine; but is an element introduced by decomposition. The process of its formation is a natural one, it is true; the decaying of grapes is also a natural process; but who would claim that on this account decayed grapes better represent the fruit of the vine than do those that have been preserved in a fresh state by counteracting the natural processes? I dwell upon this point because, absurd as it may seem when viewed in its true light, this error of



considering fermented wine to be the only true liquid product of the vine has obtained so strong a hold upon the popular mind, that in many instances when wine is to be obtained for the communion service much greater care is taken to obtain that which contains alcohol, than to secure the presence of any other token of connection with the vine. I once knew a church where *currant* wine was used, because it was the only kind of fermented wine easily obtained. Now what could suggest the use of currant wine? Merely the fact that it contained alcohol. Yet, doubtless, the members of that church would have been horrified if any one had suggested that water would answer every purpose. But water is as closely allied with the vine as is currant wine. How much better is the position of those churches that use wines of commerce? The practical impossibility of procuring real wine from ordinary dealers is notorious. Most of the so-called wines are manufactured compounds of distilled spirits and other substances, which as well represent the fruit of the vine as would the same quantity of naphtha. If some one would write a reliable treatise on "The Modern Wines of America," it would be much more to the point, and would have more weight in deciding the question of Communion wine than a dozen folio volumes on the "Wines of the Bible."

It may be urged, that in the *color* of the wine lies the symbolism. In the light of John vi. 55, this argument is a short-sighted one, and arises from a partial conception of the antitype. But, granting that it carries some weight when urged against the substitution of water at the Supper, it would be utterly without force as against unfermented grape juice.

Turn now from the significance to the purpose of the

symbols. The purpose of all symbols is to make clear the facts symbolized. Emblems in themselves are nothing but helps to our imperfect natures, serving to quicken the imagination and assist the memory. It is essential, therefore, that the mind should not dwell upon the symbol, but should use it merely as a bridge by means of which to pass quickly over to the great facts to which it leads. In the case before us, whatever tends to attract the attention to the materials also tends to distract it from their spiritual significance, and thus to counteract the intended effect of the ordinance. This must frequently be the effect of using fermented wine, which cannot fail to arrest the attention of those to whom alcoholic beverages are a novelty. Hence, *by the use of an element which has become so unfamiliar to many of us, we are, in a measure, obscuring the significance and defeating the purpose of the very ordinance we intend to fulfill.*

The force of this argument has long been tacitly acknowledged so far as it relates to the bread of the Communion. The strongest advocate for the use of fermented wine must at least admit a verdict of "not proven" on the question of the wine used by our Lord. As to the bread, on the other hand, no one can raise a question. *It was unleavened bread.* Why should we act contrary to known example in the latter case, and cling to that which is so warmly disputed in the former? Leaven is everywhere spoken of in the Scriptures as a symbol of corruption. At the Passover feast, as well as in the matter of offerings to the Lord, the laws for its exclusion were very strict, and every Jew was exceedingly scrupulous in the observance of those laws. But there were no *Biblical* laws regarding the wine. That was wholly at the option of the user. Hence we must



infer that the character of the bread was a matter of much greater importance than the quality of the wine. Why then should we strain out the gnat in the wine, and swallow the camel in the bread? The churches have almost universally abandoned the use of unleavened bread, because the universal common-sense of the church, aided by the inconvenience of procuring such bread, has easily arrived at the conclusion that the spirit of the institution is, in this particular, best promoted by a departure from the original custom. But fermented wine is easily obtained, and is surrounded by a sort of poetic halo ; hence the universal common-sense works more slowly upon this point.

If in the foregoing pages I have succeeded in establishing these two points, first, that the use of fermented wine at the Communion is a source of evil, inasmuch as it places the Church of Christ in a false position before the world, and therefore causes the enemies of God to blaspheme, and also that it causes weak brethren to stumble ; and second, that the custom does not rest upon the divine command, but rather, in our present state of society, counteracts the intent of that command and obscures the significance of the divinely appointed ordinance, let us now apply to the question the fundamental Christian maxim of I. Cor. VIII. 13. "If meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh forever more, that I make not my brother to stumble."

I have already drawn the parallel of the condition. I have shown that the use of fermented wine at the Lord's Supper does, both directly and indirectly, cause weak brethren to stumble. There is, then, no escape from the conclusion. The apostle does not say, "I will eat no flesh for evermore, that *it* make not my

brother to stumble," or, "that my brother stumble not." He comes out boldly with the acknowledgment of his personal responsibility in the matter. He has previously stated in the clearest terms his own perfect liberty. He doubts not that he has a *right* to eat flesh if he desires it. But he recognizes the fact that he is responsible for the use of that liberty, and that if a weak brother falls in consequence of his otherwise righteous act, he will not be guiltless in the sight of God. Is it possible to avoid the application? Are not the cases exactly parallel? The Christian who is strong, undoubtedly has the *right* to drink fermented wine at the Lord's Supper, or upon any other occasion, but if by that use a single weak brother is ensnared, he must be prepared to accept for himself the apostle's conclusion, "*I make my brother to stumble,*" and also the warning of our Lord, "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble, it were better for him if a great mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea."

GEORGE H. HUBBARD.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT UNDER  
THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION.

## CHAPTER I.

And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.—*Gen. i. 2.*

“In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.”—*Confession of Faith of Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.*

“In the unity of the Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity.”—*Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith.*

“And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.”—*Methodist Discipline.*

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.”

“And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God.”

“And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life; who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified.”—*Episcopal Prayer Book, p. 32.*

If these declarations of faith are in accord with the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit is divine, and has distinct personality. It must not, therefore, be regarded as a mere attribute of the Father; nor simply as an effluence or breathing forth of power. It is not the Father

in creative energy; nor the Son in restoring sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, or life to the dead. Father and Son together do not constitute or generate the Spirit. The Holy Ghost has an existence equally with the Father and the Son. Without the Spirit the Godhead would lack perfection, and without perfection there could be no Godhead.

Theories avail but little if facts are contrary. The history of redemption, so far as that history is completed, is full of facts which antagonize all theories that deny the personal existence of the Holy Ghost. Those who deny the Spirit's personality must do so either on the ground that no such person is needed in carrying forward the work of man's redemption, or that the Scriptures do not justify any one in teaching such personality. Either of these positions clearly established would be conclusive against all opposition. But who has been able to establish either? Many religionists have sought to exclude the Holy Spirit from the plan of salvation; and if God had left the matter to the will of man, they might have succeeded. If they could prove that there was no Holy Ghost, what good could they accomplish? Would the world be wiser or better under that kind of teaching than it is at present? Are people who deny the presence, power, and personal agency of the Spirit more intelligent, pious, or useful in society than those who contend for such doctrines? Do they bear the cross with more devotion, or zeal, or earnestness? Has the gospel, with its light and cheer, been carried into heathen lands by those people more than by others? Surely "by their fruits ye shall know them;" and if teachers of that class have induced men to become religious, have built up the Church of Christ, and, in general,

have honored Christianity more than others, then they have some right to claim that they have the truth with them.

Ecclesiastical history, however, in its reports, is not favorable to such a claim. If any reasonable objection could be urged against the doctrine of the Spirit's divine personality, if it could be shown that this doctrine leads to error and evil rather than to good, then its opponents would have solid ground upon which to stand. If man in his search for truth, in his aspirations for immortality, in his yearning for consolation, needs no help, no assisting grace, no power to quicken, no "washing of regeneration," then the Spirit's agency would not be so much needed. If human nature had within itself sufficient virtue for its own purification, and for coming into harmony and communion with the Father, then no other agency or assistance would be required. And if, after reconciliation to God, men would walk uprightly, avoid the evil, and of their own virtue diligently apply themselves to the Master's work; if in their journey through the wilderness of the world they needed no manna from heaven, or water from the Rock, no comfort of love, or cheer of hope, or assurance of faith, then they ought to gain admission to the heavenly Canaan without the assistance of the Holy Spirit. If man were merely an animal—a high order of earthly being, developed from the ape, or other low type of life, as some pretended scientists attempt to teach, then he would not need the aid of the Holy Ghost to quicken and purify his immortal spirit; for he would have no immortal spirit to quicken. He would spend his day on earth, come to the end of life, and die as the brute dieth. Or if, after the six days' work of creation, when God had made all things

very good, he had thrown the world with all its creatures and its interest into space as a lawless wanderer, and had withdrawn his care, and withheld his daily providence from man, then no Holy Ghost could be expected. But who that knows anything of the history of the human race, of their depravity and degradation, their superstition and idolatry, their proneness to sin and their actual transgressions, would venture to say that no Holy Ghost is needed in the work of human redemption? Who that has examined his own heart, and has heeded his own conscious knowledge, can say that he is sufficient for his own salvation? Who that has read the Holy Writ in its types and prophecies, its psalms and histories, can deny that the Scriptures teach the personal presence and power of the Holy Ghost in man's redemption? So numerous and so well known are the passages of Scripture in which the Holy Spirit is shown to be a personal agent, and which teach so clearly his Divine nature, that no effort will be made here to group them into one view. As quotations may be made to present other points, these also will appear.

#### THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The first question is: What part has the Holy Spirit in the great plan of salvation? The answer is not difficult. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Man by his sin turned away from God and became an alien. Before this sin he had enjoyed sweet communion with the Father. With pleasure he had heard the voice of the Almighty, and, having been made upright, he was fully qualified to stand in the presence of his God without fear or shame. After the sin the case was different. Man fled and sought to hide himself from the Lord, and the Lord withdrew from that intimate communion which existed before, and drove

the man from his presence. Moral degradation was the logical result. The pure life that before was in man and that thrilled his soul with joy was succeeded by the sting of death. Man was a wreck, and the brightest prospect that ever bloomed on earth was blasted. The atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ, to be finished in the fulness of time, then took effect and saved man from immediate destruction. The virtue of that atonement stayed for awhile the full execution of sentence—the infliction of the penalty—and gave man a day of probation and a chance for life.

The office now of the Holy Spirit is to restore man to the favor and friendship of the Father; to convince him of his sin, regenerate his heart, and re-establish that sweet communion which was lost. It is the Spirit's work to quicken the dead soul of man, to inspire it again with life, and to make it fit for the indwelling of God. Christ by his atonement opened for man the way back to the Paradise of God; the Holy Spirit assists and leads in that way all who submit to be led.

The influence of the Spirit is not irresistible. Many yield to that influence, and are led in the ways of peace; may others resist, and are left to the blindness of their own minds. The Spirit is sufficient for all, but he destroys the agency of none.

#### HIS WORK UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION.

From certain passages in the New Testament some have supposed that the Holy Spirit in his work is connected only with the Christian dispensation, and that he began his work on the day of Pentecost. Here are some of the passages:

1. "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that



believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified."—John vii. 39.

2. "And I will pray the Father, and shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."—John xiv. 16, 17, 26.

3. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me."—John xv. 26.

4. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come."—John xvi. 13.

These passages clearly teach that, at the time they were uttered, the sending and giving of the Holy Ghost in the sense intended was then in the future. But they teach also that in a very important sense the Savior was referring to the extraordinary and wonderful outpouring of the Holy Ghost which afterward occurred on the day of Pentecost, and which conferred on the apostles and some others the knowledge of other tongues and the power to work miracles. Christ himself in proper person was soon to be taken from the presence of his disciples and have his abode at the right hand of majesty on high. But according to another



promise he was to be with his disciples wheresoever two or three should meet together in his name. This promise is fulfilled by the presence of the Holy Spirit, the divine person, who has his permanent abode in the true spiritual Church of God. Several remarks are here appropriate :

1. The Pentecostal display of the Spirit's power did not prove that the Spirit had not been in the Church before that time, but it indicated and evinced the beginning of a new dispensation. Before the incarnation of the Son, the Church had been under a schooling of types and shadows, of shedding of blood, and divers kinds of offerings. When the most important of these found their antitype in Christ they were no longer to be observed, and the dispensation which they characterized had an end. No more offerings for sin were required; and the Church, so long under the bondage of ceremonial statute, and limited in its sphere of operation, was then freed from its restraints and bidden to go forth and bear the news of salvation to all people. Old things had passed away, and at Jerusalem, the center of the ceremonial system, and the place where the Lamb of God was sacrificed, where men from many of the adjacent nations were gathered for religious services, the Holy Ghost was abundantly poured out, and this marked the new state of things as pre-eminently the dispensation of the Spirit.

2. Pentecost had been a subject of both type and prophecy. Joel, the prophet, was enabled by the Spirit of God to foretell the great out-pouring of the Holy Ghost; and St. Peter, in his discourse as recorded in Acts, chapter II., declared that the wonderful display of spiritual power, at which "they were all amazed," was exactly "that which was spoken of by the prophet

Joel." Of the three great annual festivals which the Jews were required to keep, Pentecost was the second. It occurred on the fiftieth day after the first of the Passover. It was called "*the feast of harvest*" and "*the day of first fruits.*"

This was the time when the Jews rendered thank-offerings to God for the bounties of harvest. Always the harvest has been a time of rejoicing to the husbandman. As an expression of his joy and gratitude to the Giver of all good, the Jew was instructed to bring the *first fruits* of his gathered grain as a thank-offering to the Lord. Our Savior taught his disciples: "The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth laborers into his harvest."—Luke x. 2. And again: "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to the harvest."—John iv. 35. These same disciples having seen him forty days after his resurrection, and having followed him "out as far as to Bethany," and they having received his parting blessing "returned to Jerusalem with great joy," and went into the temple "praising and blessing God." "And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room" and there "continued with one accord in prayer and supplication;" doubtless for the fulfillment of his promises concerning the Comforter as well as for more laborers in the harvest. This praising and blessing God, and prayer and supplication, lasted about ten days. Forty days he was seen of them, from the resurrection to the ascension, then ten days of prayer, and "the day of Pentecost was fully come." On that day the Holy Ghost came upon them in power and to an extent never known before, and gathered into the Church the *first*

*fruits* of the gospel harvest from the great field of the world.

3. The Scriptures of the Old Testament were chiefly concerned in foretelling the coming of the Savior, and in bearing testimony to his exalted character. By type and symbol, by sacrifice and offering, by special precept and public festival, he was kept constantly before the minds of the people. The sweet songs of Zion were rich in instruction, and were as full of the doctrine of the Holy One as they were of the melody of song. The voice of the prophet, though often lifted up in denouncing the sins of the people, yet, through all the ages, was heard declaring the coming of the Messiah as the consolation of Israel and the desire of all nations. In the plan of salvation the work of the Son, logically, comes first. He is the foundation—the Rock upon which the Church is built. The Holy Spirit is the architect that builds the Church upon the Rock. And, as it is necessary that a foundation must be laid before a superstructure can be built upon it, so it was proper that in the first dispensation under God's written Word Christ should be the more prominently set forth.

4. He would be a poor theologian who would teach that there was no Christ in the world before the incarnation—no Savior before the crucifixion. Yet, that was the time when Christ the Son was personally present in the world, and when "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." That was the fulness of time when he finished the work which the Father had given him to do. But surely many had been saved before this period in the world's history; and as "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," they must have been saved through him. And how could they have been

saved through him, unless the work done by him had been as efficacious before the incarnation as it was afterward? Therefore, as all those passages which speak of the Savior's work on earth must be understood in accordance with the history of the Church previous to that time, so those passages which speak of the *giving* and *sending* of the Holy Spirit must be likewise understood.

5. Faith is spoken of in Gal. III. 23-25, as having come *after the law*. "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed; wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster." If any one, from this passage, should undertake to teach that there was no faith until the law was fulfilled in Christ, he would soon be in confusion. Scriptural history has on record too many facts antagonistic to such a theory. The author of the Epistle to the Galatians, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, has given a considerable list of worthies who all died in the faith: St. Paul evidently, in this passage as in many others, was comparing the dispensation in which he lived with that under the law. The law required many works to be performed. Under the Christian dispensation these works were not required, but *faith in God through our Lord Jesus Christ was required*. As the law then was the dispensation of works, the Christian dispensation, which came after the law, was one pre-eminently of faith.

6. The Holy Spirit is divine—is God, therefore he is omnipotent and omnipresent, and no man may say unto him, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." He works when, how, and where he will. If means

exist he may use them, or he may come directly in contact with the hearts of the people. As his work is connected with, and additional to, the atonement of Christ, it is natural and logical to suppose that his influence is co-extensive with that atonement, and reaches as "far as the curse is found."

7. The plan of salvation is characterized by perfect unity. The work of Christ and the work of the Holy Ghost are distinct, yet they are in exact harmony and mutually relate to each other. The Church of God also is a unit. From the days of righteous Abel until the present time God has had a Church on earth. There has never been but one Church. It has been the symbol of the body of Christ, and the Holy Ghost has had his dwelling place within the Church, as the life and soul of that body. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."

8. St. John 1. 17, says: "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Can any one suppose that St. John intended to teach that there was no *grace and truth* under the law? Surely not. St. John evidently meant that after Christ came his people were no longer to be under bondage to the burdensome ritual of the law, but in the liberty of the gospel there was more abundant grace and a greater revelation of truth. So it is with the work of the Spirit. Under the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensations, he has done, and continues to do, the same kind of work; but under the last, there are more gracious out-pourings, more wonderful displays of his presence and power, and his leadership in the Church is more distinctly presented. "He will guide you into all truth" is an authoritative announcement of the spiritual dispensation which was soon to

open on the world in the glorious harvest of the Pentecost.

On the question of the work and office of the Holy Spirit before and after the time of Christ on earth, Cardinal Manning, a distinguished Catholic writer, in a work entitled the *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* uses this language: "Again it is evident that this dispensation of the Spirit, since the incarnation of the Son, and from the day of Pentecost, differs in many critical and characteristic ways from his presence and office in the world before the advent of Jesus Christ. It differs not only in exuberance of gifts and graces, nor only in its miraculous manifestations, nor again in its universality, as if what was given before in measure was given afterwards in fulness, but in a deeper way, that is, in the office which He has assumed, and in the manner of His presence. I. And, first, the Holy Ghost came before into the world by His universal operations in all mankind, but now He comes through the Incarnate Son by a special and personal presence. \* \* \* The Spirit of God had wrought before throughout the whole race descended from the first Adam. He came now by a special and personal mission to work in the children of the second Adam. The first Adam by sin forfeited for himself and for us the presence and grace of the Holy Ghost; the second Adam has restored to His children the presence and the grace which had been lost; but with this difference—the first Adam was man, the second Adam was God."—pp. 64, 65. Again on page 68: "II. The second characteristic difference is, that the Holy Ghost came to create the mystical body of Christ. Until the day of Pentecost the mystical body was not complete. There could be no body till there was a



Head. There was no Head until the Son was incarnate; and even when incarnate the completion of the body was deferred until the Head was glorified." And on pages 72, 73: "Thirdly, a farther characteristic difference is constituted by the indissoluble union between the Holy Ghost and the mystical body. Before the incarnation, the Holy Spirit wrought in the souls of men one by one, illuminating, converting, sanctifying, and perfecting the elect. But the union between His presence and the soul was conditional on the correspondence and fidelity of the individual."

This author teaches that during the Old Testament times the work of the Holy Spirit was more general, and that it embraced the whole race descended from Adam; but after Christ it was more specific, and embraced those only who were the children of the second Adam. He insists upon the doctrine that the Spirit works now only *within the Church*. While he claims greater exuberance and grace of the Spirit under the Christian dispensation, he seeks to confine them to much narrower limits. This idea antagonizes the general teachings of the Christian ministry on this subject; and it certainly fails to harmonize with such a passage of Holy Writ as this: "And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."—John xvi. 8-11. Under the Christian dispensation revelation is much fuller and clearer than in former times, the out-pourings of the Spirit are more abundant; and it would be strange if, at the same time, the Spirit should be so much limited in its sphere of operation. The true doctrine doubtless, is, that *the*

*Holy Spirit has always had the world for its field and the whole race of man for the subjects of its influence.*

But the Scriptures themselves must tell the story of the Spirit's work. Hear what they say: Gen. i. 23: "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." From this passage it would seem that the Spirit had been personally interested in the affairs of this world even before man was created. The chaotic mass of earthly matters had been created, but it lacked that form and comeliness which it afterwards possessed. No living thing was upon the earth, nor was any germ of life within it. Throughout all its borders, its length and depth, there was a lifeless void. No pulse nor throb was felt, silence, coldness, deadness, reigned supreme; "And darkness was upon the face of the deep." This was a suitable covering for the earth at that time. Darkness and deadness are twins. Had there been any life on the earth, darkness would have been unfavorable to its continuance. The earth had no power by spontaneous action to generate life, nor had the darkness power to produce light. Therefore, if life and light exist on the earth they must exist from the operation of some other power. Concerning that power we are not without information. In one short sentence the inspired penman has given the history: "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." What a wonderful move was that! The Spirit of God penetrates the darkness and touches the face of the waters. That was the initial movement for a change; and, oh, what a change! The history does not say how long the Spirit was moving upon the face



of the waters, nor does it tell the intent of the move, or whether anything was done by the Spirit as he moved. But the next sentence records a new state of things: "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." The movement of the Spirit could not have been aimless. His going over the face of the waters was for the accomplishment of some purpose, and that purpose must be inferred from the sequents of the movement. The first one is light, which came by the first recorded order of God himself; then the dividing of the waters, and the appearance of the dry land and the seas. Afterwards came vegetable and animal life in all their varied forms. True, these are not given in the history as the necessary consequents of the Spirit's movement; but they follow in such orderly connection, and the work of the Spirit as given in other parts of the Scriptures is so intimately connected with light, order, and life, that we cannot be far wrong in supposing that the movement of the Spirit was, at least, preparatory to these events. And, if this interpretation be correct, we have at once the main characteristics of his office; that is, his presence gives light and his touch gives life. His power is formative; and order, form and comeliness result from his work.

This is very similar to the Spirit's work upon the sinner's heart, if indeed it does not foreshadow it. Look at the condition and the work. The sinner's heart is destitute of spiritual life. It is dead by nature, as well as "dead in trespasses and in sins." Deep moral darkness enshrouds, and no cheer of living hope relieves the gloom. But the Spirit of God moves upon that heart and quickens it. He sheds there a pure light and the darkness flees. He touches the springs of action

and the heart pulsates with a fulness of life. The gloom is gone, and hope has anchored within the veil.

Thus, in the very beginning of Holy Writ the Spirit is revealed as a personal agent, and one interested in the well-being of earth. He showed that interest in his own voluntary work in bringing order out of chaos, and in introducing light which dispelled the original darkness. Man's abode was not yet ready for him, but by the continued results of the Spirit's work, by the exercise of that omnipotent power which is ascribed to him, the formative process continued until all things were ready. The waters were gathered into their place and filled with living creatures; the buoyant air became instinct with life; and the land, bearing its rich abundance of the vegetable and the animal kingdom, was clothed with a beauty and grandeur hitherto unknown. These are sequents of the Spirit's move upon the waters, and they so clearly bear his impress that they may be regarded as his works. If the interpretation just given is correct, then also the fact of man's introduction into life is attributable to the Holy Spirit. Man was the last of the Creator's works—the crowning glory of earth. As the Spirit of God had moved over the face of the waters, and that move had been succeeded by life, so after the dry land appeared “the Lord God,” that is, the same Spirit, “formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” On earth there was abundant life, and all that life was from the Spirit. Matter of itself is incapable of life; but the Spirit is life itself, and the source of all vitality. The first man did not come into existence as did the men after him; he was the beginning, and owed his origin directly to creative power.

The Scriptural history of the origin of the human nature of the second Adam throws some light on the question before us. The first Adam was the representative of his race, and so was the second. The interests and destinies of the race were much involved in the disobedience of the first, and in the obedience of the second. The second, as well as the first, had existence not by ordinary generation, but by the immediate agency of God. Matt. i. 20. That passage teaches that the Holy Ghost originated the human nature of Christ, the second Adam. And as the Holy Spirit would not have need to change the style, plan or character of his work; as there would, in all his operations, be a unity of design, it is reasonable to conclude that he at the first originated human nature. Christian people, generally, teach that in order to salvation man must have a new birth. That birth is such as to make man a new creature. It is, therefore, a new creation, and is the work of the Holy Ghost. If, then, the Holy Spirit is the special divine person operating in the new creation, certainly it is not illogical to say that his power first transformed lifeless dust into human form and substance, and caused man to become a living soul.

"Creator Spirit, by whose aid  
The world's foundations first were laid,  
Come, visit every waiting mind;  
Come, pour thy joys on human kind."

F. R. EARLE.

## AN EXPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF JOB.

GOLDEN TEXT.—“Doth Job fear God for nought?”

As to whether there was in fact such a man as Job, and such persons as his three friends, and Elihu, the conservator between the two parties, and such occurrences as are narrated in this book, has no special bearing on the subject-matter discussed therein, and the principles, doctrines, and truths evolved and established. The whole matter might simply be an allegory, and yet the doctrines and subject-matter discussed, eliminated, and established thereby, be substantially the same as if it were a real history of occurrences and facts. We believe, however, that the book is a real history of persons, facts, and occurrences. And we submit that the historic facts that such men as Job, his three friends, and Elihu lived, and the incidents and occurrences narrated, are as well or better authenticated than the record of any other person or circumstances in the land of Uz, in that far-off day.

## THE BOOK OF JOB PER SE.

First, It is the most ancient of books. The Bible is the oldest book extant, and the book of Job is the oldest book of the Bible. Secondly, Taken as a whole, it constitutes a dramatic poem, the richest, most perfect, and the sublimest ever written in human language. It is absolutely inimitable—cannot be equaled in dramatic poetry, much less surpassed. Thirdly, The topics treated and doctrines discussed in this drama, are the profoundest ever presented to the human mind—topics, too, which most interest the human family;

and which have engaged the deepest thoughts and profoundest investigations of the purest philosophers and best thinkers in all ages. But none, prior to, so far as we know, and absolutely none subsequently, have investigated and resolved those abstruse, but yet interesting questions, equal to the inspired and dramatic poet of the land of Uz.

There are three great controversies carried on and dramatically discussed in this book. 1. *Is there such a thing as sincere piety, pure, disinterested, and unselfish religion to be found among fallen men?* The parties to this controversy are God and Satan, as is indicated in the text, "*Does Job fear God for nought?*" 2. *The source and proper purpose of affliction, and the nature of the connection between sin and suffering.* The parties to this controversy are Job and his three friends, and Elihu, the daysman between them. 3. *The justice or injustice of God in subjecting Job to the fearful calamity and unparalleled suffering sent upon him.* The parties to this controversy are God and Job, and Elihu the Buzite as an intervener. It is in the first of these controversies that the grand regulating, contrasting, and all controlling thought of the drama is found. The second and third controversies are evolved and formulated in the onward progress and development of that germinal thought, in the practical evolution of the ultimate purpose couched in that grand idea. The root question, then, is not, why do afflictions come to a righteous man? It is the question raised in the golden text, "*Does Job fear God for nought?*" or otherwise expressed, thus, Can there be such a thing as sincere and disinterested piety—true religion among fallen men? That is the basal question of the whole matter under controversy.

We submit, that if there be no such a thing as sincere piety—true religion, if it cannot be produced and exist in fallen man, if it is an impossibility on earth; then the whole divine scheme of human redemption is a failure—a sad and fearful failure too; and the Devil has and will triumph over the whole human family. Satan, in this question which he propounds to God, “Does Job fear God for nought?” in effect says, There is plenty of the show and appearance of *religion* and *piety*, but really there is *none*—for where there seems to be, it is for some inherent and radically selfish purpose. And his incarnate emissaries have in all ages, as now, taken up the echo, and with trumpet tongues have sounded it to earth’s remotest bounds and among all peoples and kindreds. In opposition to this impious, presumptuous, and impudent assertion, God affirms, not only that there can be such a thing as true religion, but that it does really exist among fallen men. It is in the determination of this point that the grand regulating thought of the drama is found.

This brings us to the prologue of the grand drama, which introduces Job.

*Job enters.*

Who is he? He is an Arabian prince, of great wealth, great wisdom and learning, extensive influence, unblemished character, immense popularity, and deep and genuine piety. He is a suitable man in whose person to test and determine this all-important question. Now, in time, and not in eternity, this question is to be tried and settled. Nor is this a question of mere argumentation. It is a practical question, and can only be settled by practically putting it to the test. Now, if one such disinterestedly pious man can be found on earth, then the question is settled on God’s side. And

if a proper subject can be found in whose person to make the trial, the question may be solved by one test case; because if such a person fail, under fair trial, it is presumable that all others would likewise fail; whilst, if he stand, then others may stand—all may stand the crucial test. So the question is settled either way.

The prologue of the drama being spoken in the first five verses of the first chapter, the curtain rises with the sixth verse, and the play begins.

## ACT I.

A scene in heaven, or in the Church, or wherever the sons of God had met to worship.

Verse 6.—“Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them.

7.—“And the Lord said unto Satan, whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.

8.—“And the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that *there is* none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil?

9.—“Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, Doth Job fear God for nought?

10.—“Hast thou not made a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all he hath on every side? thou hast blessed the works of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land.

11.—“But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face.

12.—“And the Lord said unto Satan, Behold, all



that he hath *is* in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord."

Now, God having affirmed of his servant Job that there was none like him in all the world—a perfect and upright man—one that feared God and eschewed evil; and Satan having impudently denied all this, and having, in effect, affirmed that Job's piety, uprightness, and religion were but the gilded shadow of piety, virtue, and religion, which waited on his prosperity, and would vanish like frost before the rising sun at the first approach of darkness or touch of adversity, this is an admirable opportunity to test and bring to a close this controversy, as to whether there be such a thing as true religion on earth. So God gives the entire substance of Job into the hands of Satan; only he was not to touch the person of Job; saying in effect to him, You affirm falsely of my servant Job, that his piety is but the shadow of piety, that it is inherent selfishness, and only waits on his prosperity; and that if I were to but "touch his substance, he would curse me to my face." Now, here is a chance. Try it. And he will prove your assertion false. The challenge is accepted by Satan, and with terrible rapidity the experiment is made. He at once speeds back to earth, and moving up his engines of destruction with consummate skill, like a navy general, and by a series of terrible successive blows, he deprives Job within one short day of all his immense possessions, beloved family and happy servants, and left him bereaved and broken-hearted, a despoiled and bankrupt old man, on the scenes of his former happiness and glory.

And there was a day when his sons and his daughters

*were* eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house: there came a messenger unto Job, and said, The oxen were plowing, and the asses were feeding beside them: and the Sabeans fell *upon them*, and took them away; yea, they have slain the servants with the edge of the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee. While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and said, The fire of God is fallen from heaven, and hath burned up the sheep, and the servants, and consumed them; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee. While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and said, the Chaldeans made out three bands, and fell upon the camels, and have carried them away, yea, and slain the servants with the edge of the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee. While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and said, Thy sons and thy daughters *were* eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house: and, behold, there came a great wind from the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon the young men, and they are dead; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee."

What a fearful storm of calamities to fall in quick succession upon one man; for the one messenger had not finished speaking till another came. But, notwithstanding the terrible rapidity with which the storm of ruin overtakes him, and the fearfulness of the blast, yet he is not jostled in his faith. He holds on to his integrity. The issue is so far decided in favor of God, true religion and genuine piety, and against Satan.

"Then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his head, and fell down upon the ground and worshipped, and said, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord

gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord. In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly."

What a victory! Was there ever anything like it on earth before? Never. It is perfectly unique.

The first act is finished—the first scene is closed—the curtain falls, and leaves the issue so far decided in favor of God and religion, and against Satan and his incarnate emissaries.

#### ACT II.

Scene still in heaven. The curtain rises. The first scene is in part repeated.

The sons of God again assemble before God to worship. Satan re-appears and the old controversy is renewed. Jehovah affirms the integrity of his servant Job, notwithstanding all that had befallen him. The same questions being asked of Satan by God, as to where he had been and from whence he came, and answered in like manner as before, he thus addresses him again:

"And the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that *there is* none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? And still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movedst me against him."

To this Satan replied, the trial was not severe enough; that it did not come near enough to his person. "And Satan answered the Lord, and said, Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face." So God turns the patriarch over again into Satan's hands, saying, in effect, Try your utmost with him, do your worst, only

save his life. "Behold he is in thine hands; but save his life."

*Exit Satan.* The curtain falls, and leaves God and his sons alone within. Satan speeds to earth again on lightning wings, and without delay lays his blasting hand on Job, and smites him with sore bodily affliction. "So went Satan forth from the presence of the Lord, and smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot to his crown. And he took him a potsherd to scrape himself withal; and he sat down among the ashes."

#### ACT III.

Scene on earth. The curtain rises.

Behold the lordly man, who used to "wash his steps with butter, before whom the rocks poured forth rivers of oil," sitting among the ashes on the site of his once palatial mansion, covered with loathsome running sores, and scraping himself with a potsherd; and his bereaved wife sitting near him in sack-cloth and ashes. What a lonely and afflictive scene. The two old folks sitting all alone in ashes on the scene, where, but yesterday, as it were, there were glad, merry and cheerful hearts; joy, singing and music; smiling children, cheerful servants, bleating flocks and lowing herds, oceans of butter and honey, milk and corn, wine and oil. But now a charred, blackened and blasted waste, with but two solitary and afflicted persons on the spot.

But, as if this suffering and humiliation were not enough to blast his hopes, wither his spirits, and ruin his faith, there was a sharper arrow in the Devil's quiver to be shot at him in the person of his unbelieving wife. Although she was aware of the controversy being settled in the person of her smitten husband, she lost

all patience, and urged him to bring the controversy to a close by renouncing his allegiance to God. "Then said his wife unto him, Dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God and die." Now, if this woman ever was a true believer (which we doubt), she had fallen as mother Eve before the tempter; and as Satan, through Eve, deceived Adam, so he thought to overcome Job, in another direction, through his wife. But he signally failed. The calm, heroic sufferer, in the fulness of the integrity of his heart, responded to this ill advice: "Thou speaketh as one of the foolish women speaketh. What! shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord and shall we not receive evil? In all this did not Job sin with his lips." Again the victory is on the Lord's side. The curtain falls, and leaves Job still in the ashes, all alone.

## ACT IV.

Scène still on earth, and at the old homestead of Job. The curtain rises. Job's three friends, with dust besprinkled, enter and take their seats with Job.

Behold Job still sitting in the ashes, and his three friends sitting with him, in solemn silence. His wife has retired from the scene, and we hear of her no more. Thrice has Satan been foiled, and his purposes thwarted. The loss of his substance and great wealth, the loss of his happy family and servants, his sore bodily afflictions, and the sorer trial of his bosom friend turning against him, telling him to renounce his allegiance to God, and then forsaking him in his great afflictions, could not shake his faith, or move him from his integrity to God. But there is still a sharper and more poisonous and more effective arrow in the Devil's quiver. He had yet to be subjected, as the climax of

his trials and temptations, to calumny and misrepresentation, to be persuaded against his will under the guise of friendly sympathy and deep concern for the welfare of his soul; and to be told that God had forsaken him, that he was a base hypocrite, that he was not a just man at all, but an abominable sinner, who had hitherto passed for a saint and too long escaped deserved punishment, but which at last had now overtaken him. This, to a sensitive spirit like Job's, was more acute than any physical suffering could possibly be, and more difficult to be borne than any of his former trials. His friends were pious and well meaning men, but they were mistaken in their judgment, and thus unwillingly became the instruments in Satan's hands of the severest trials to Job; and well nigh, in the end, succeeded in effecting all that Satan wanted to break down his faith in God.

It was in the working out of this part of the drama that the second controversy arose, to-wit: *The proper end and purpose of affliction, and the connection subsisting between suffering and sin.* Job's three friends had an apparent victory at this stage of the controversy. They held that the ills and sufferings of men in this life are always the logical and immediate result of sin, and the visitations from God on account of sin. So from a man's misfortunes and sufferings we can infer his sin; of sin, too, unrepented of and persisted in; and the greater the misfortunes and afflictions, the greater the sin. This opinion is pretty generally received at this day. Now, Job's friends, to our mind, reversed the order of moral reasoning. They did not first collect their facts, and form their theory from those facts, which is the correct and logical mode of moral reasoning; but, forming their theory out of their

own thoughts, they went out into the broad streets and thoroughfares of life, and interpreted by means of it whatsoever facts they found to exist there.

The arguments and reasoning they used in trying to convince and reform Job, in their many speeches, may be summed up about thus: God is holy, and cannot but hate sin; just, and cannot but punish it; merciful, and must be gracious to the persistent sinner. When, then, a man is overtaken by calamity, it is God visiting his transgressions upon him. And to this rule, according to their logic, there are no exceptions. Judged according to this rule, Job must have been a great sinner, the *very* "*chief of sinners*," and all his former pretended piety but splendid hypocrisy; else why were his misfortunes and sufferings so unparalleled and great? Judging him thus, Job's three friends esteemed it their one great duty to convince him of his great sinfulness, and to reclaim him therefrom, and to restore him to the favor of God; and very solemnly, earnestly and eloquently did they address themselves to this self-imposed task. Their sentiments, repeatedly delivered in their many speeches, were a reproduction of their theory, couched in language ever varying—now touched with pathetic tenderness for the old man's suffering, and now flavored with indignation at the apparent contempt with which he seemed to listen to their earnest platitudes, and now, at last, breaking out into point-blank accusations, as in the third speech of Eliphaz; but always impulsive, stately, and sublime. Job's constant answer to these earnest appeals was, that he did not believe their theory, and much less their deductions from that theory concerning himself the correctness of which negation the sequel will abundantly show. He admitted, however, as a strict analysis of



his several answers to the addresses of his three friends will show, that suffering is the logical fruit of sin; but denied that the degree of a man's guilt could always be estimated and measured by his sufferings, or that his sufferings could at all times be referred to his personal guilt as cause. He maintained that God could not prevent justice, but that he often overlooked and overwhelmed the wicked and the good in the same calamities, and that, therefore, the good often suffered by reason of their connection with the evil; and further, he admits that God often brings calamities and afflictions on the good for the trial of their faith, and for other purposes, inscrutable to us; as the trial of the faith of the righteous is more precious than gold and silver that perisheth. He admitted, also, that he was a sinner, but not in the sense they alleged. He affirmed that, although a sinner, he was not a hypocrite and a notorious transgressor. He then charges them with refined cruelty in that, whilst pretending to be his friends and so pious, they should so aggravate a fallen man's misery, so bait and brow-beat a man's spirit when in the furnace of affliction, by their cruel denunciations and uncharitable insinuations. This he in effect affirms was almost enough to drive a man mad, to make him drift away from his moorings of faith in God. And, as for Job, if it had not been for his faith in a future state—another world—where all the anomalies of this life shall be fully explained and satisfactorily settled, he could not have endured these reproaches amidst his so great suffering, and have continued steadfast in his allegiance to God. As it was, they nearly succeeded in making shipwreck of his faith. They not only intensified his sufferings, but so irritated his spirit as to drive him to over-estimate his innocence,

till, from thinking that all was right in his afflictions, he began to think that God was dealing hard with him, in not vindicating him of the calumnies of his would-be friends, or even permitting him to suffer at all.

Thus the third controversy arises, viz: *The justice or the injustice of God in subjecting Job to the calamities endured.* The parties to this controversy are God, the patriarch Job, and Elihu the Buzite, as a days-man. This controversy commenced in its incipency almost from the moment of the arrival of Job's three friends, with rent garments and dust-besprinkled heads. Through all the solemnly silent seven days they sat together in the ashes, Job had been studying and reading their countenances and purposes with a master's skill; and now, ere they had spoken a word, he had read their suspicions as to his true piety, and their intended counsel. And, when at length they open fire on him with their insinuations of his sinfulness, and exhortations to repent and turn to God with contrition of heart, he asserted his innocence and piety with such vehemence and zeal as to frequently over-shoot the mark, and over-estimate his own righteousness. And thus, from defending himself with warmth and zeal, he drifted away from the right line into controversy with God, which is mixed up in all the series of the foregoing disputations. The full out-cropping and formulation of this controversy was the first sign that any impression had been made on Job's faith, and, gauging the vehemence and intensity of his appeals as they wax and wane, you may measure the weakness or strength of his faith. He did not advance by a steady and unebbing progress from the theory of his friends to the other extreme. But under the irritation of their charges he oscillated between faith in God and faith in

himself. Sometimes the confidence he reposed in God, with which he arose above his sufferings and afflictions, was awfully sublime, as when he exclaims, "*Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him!*" And then again he appears to be more concerned about his own integrity than God's honor and truth. His arguments quaintly expressed would be something like the following: I tell you, friends, I don't believe your theory—I don't deserve this suffering. I know it has come upon me for some wise and inscrutable purpose; but I don't deserve it. He does not say flatly, This is not what I bargained for when I became a servant of God. Had he said that, the Devil's triumph had been complete. But he did not say it.

The act now closes. The curtain falls and leaves Job and his three friends in the ashes. Each has in effect silenced the other's battery. It is rather a drawn battle—yet the three friends, though silenced, have gained an apparent victory. They have irritated Job and jostled his faith. Although silent, he is somewhat drifting from his ancient moorings in God.

## ACT V.

Scene still on earth, and around the hearthstone of Job. The curtain rises.

*Behold Job and his three friends still sitting in the ashes speechless.* They are still eyeing one another, but they have ceased to utter a word. Both parties are in solemn silence. No one moves his tongue.

*Enters Elihu the Buzite.* Although a young man, he asserts his right to speak and show his opinion. He demands that Job and his friends hear him, and that they will consider what he has to say. He first addresses Job's three friends, and tells them that in the matter of

controversy between them and Job he was right and they were wrong. Then he turns to Job, and reproves him for his petulancy and unwarrantable language employed in reference to God while under suffering; and through four successive discourses he prosecutes his arguments with much eloquence and cogency, utterly confounding Job's three friends, and causes Job himself to reflect and consider what he had said and done that was not right, and thus clears the way for the sixth act. Curtain falls.

## ACT VI.

Scene still on earth and around the hearthstone of the patriarch.

The curtain rises. Elihu continues his address to his silent hearers, Job and his friends, sitting in the ashes. He tells them, "Days should speak, and multitudes of years should teach wisdom. Although he was young, yet there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." And further he said, "Great men are not *always* wise: neither do the aged always understand judgment." And after having sharply reproved Job for over-estimating his own righteousness and placing too little on God's—thus, "For Job hath said, I am righteous: and God hath taken away my judgment. My wound *is* incurable without transgression"—he then speaks of the greatness, majesty and glory of God. "Behold, he is mighty in strength *and* wisdom. With God is terrible majesty. *Touching* the Almighty, we cannot find him out: *he is* excellent in power, and in judgment, and in plenty of justice: he will not afflict."

Whilst he is yet speaking, *a violent storm arises, and out of the whirlwind the Lord speaks to Job, saying, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words*

without knowledge?" In this address the Almighty sets before Job a representation of the divine greatness, particularly of the divine power and wisdom, as exhibited in his mighty works, so as to produce in him such a conception of the Godhead as to make error or injustice on the part of Jehovah absolutely unthinkable; and, by way of contrast, to produce in him such a profound conviction of man's weakness and unwisdom, and consequent unfitness to instruct God or challenge any of his works or ways, as to put an estoppel on all his former challenges and complaints. A good impression soon begins to show itself on Job's mind, and presently we find him saying, "Behold I am vile, what shall I answer thee? I will lay my hand upon my mouth. Once have I spoken, but I will not answer; yea, twice, but I will proceed no further." Jehovah continues his address, and the result is, Job unreservedly submits himself to God in penitence and trust, exclaiming in the fulness of his faithful heart, "I know thou canst do all things, and that no thought can be withholden from thee. Who is he that hideth counsel without knowledge? Therefore have I uttered that I understand not. Hear, I beseech thee, and I will speak; I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me. I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."

Thank God! he is saved: his doubts are all gone, his darkness is dissipated, his clouds are rifted, his fears are quelled, his anxieties are smothered to rest, the sunshine of God's reconciled countenance is lifted upon him, and the light of his love shines into his heart. Now he can suffer, if need be, and he still believes, in the calm confidence of his trusting heart, that the su-

preme God doeth all things well, wisely and justly, and beneficently, too. His temptations have all passed away, his misgiving, doubts and fears are all dissipated; his petulancy and rashness have subsided, and he settles down to rest and composure, in humble and childlike faith and trust in God. The Devil's efforts to destroy him have failed. Through the help of the divine grace, though sorely tried, he holds fast his integrity and faith in God, and thereby demonstrates the first proposition—the fact that there is such a thing as *true, sincere and disinterested piety among men*. There is one man whom no amount of misfortunes, temptations and suffering can overcome, whatever others do. “*Job fears God for nought.*” What one man by the grace of God has done, others may do, all may do, and millions have done and are now doing.

The settlement of the third controversy, that between Job and God, not only demonstrates the first postulate, viz: that there is such a thing as *true piety among men*, but it ends in the full confession of Job, that in the matter of the third proposition he was wrong and God was right. It also results in the settlement of the second controversy, that between Job and his three friends. For God, before leaving the scene, authoritatively pronounces on that proposition, and informs Job's friends that in the matter of dispute between them they were wrong and Job was right. He then directs them to offer sacrifice for their sin, and to ask Job's intercession in their behalf, and promises to forgive them thus doing.

And now, to show that the original and real question—to-wit, that between God and Satan, as to whether or not there is such a thing as *true piety, sincere and disinterested religion on earth*—has been fully and

fairly and forever settled by Job's steadfastness in the crucial test of the severest calamities, sorest afflictions and the fiercest temptations ever befalling man, we are told that the Lord also accepted Job, and God turned the captivity of Job when he prayed for his friends; also the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before in property, and the same number in family—seven sons and three daughters.

And now follows

#### THE EPILOGUE.

Job's trials ended, greater prosperity than ever attends him. His brethren and friends visit and present him with presents. God prospers him, gives him long life, and at last he dies, "being old and full of days."

And now, whilst we write these lines, away down the ever-flowing stream of time—perhaps four thousand years or more from the time in which the patriarch of the land of Uz of Chaldea lived and wrote this drama, he doubtless realizes to the full extent, in that land which time shall never dare destroy, where storms never rise, where temptations, calamities and afflictions never come, and where men do not grow old and die, what his hopes assured him of, and his faith saw afar, and his expectations realized in the flesh. "Though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: and with these very eyes shall I behold him for myself and not another."

Christ, who ever lives in heaven, makes intercession for his people. "Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Even as it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter.



Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."—Paul in Rom. VIII. 35-39.

S. R. CHADICK.

THE GENESIS IN LUTHER OF THE REFORMATION PRINCIPLE.

---

In the cottage of a poor miner, at Eisleben, one hour before midnight, Nov. 10th, 1483, a son was born to Margaret, the godly wife of pious Hans Luther. On the morrow, which happened to be Tuesday, the father carried his infant son to St. Peter's, where he dedicated him to God in the rite of baptism, and named him Martin, in commemoration of the fact that it was St. Martin's day. When the child was six months old, his parents moved to the adjoining town, Mansfeldt, where the mines were more celebrated, and the hard-working father expected to get a better living for himself and family. There young Martin received his parental training, which was severe, but earnest and conscientious. Sometimes, on very slight provocation, he was whipped until the blood came. This merciless treatment of children seems to be an incident of poor homes and grinding toil. In proportion to their elevation above the narrow confines of crowded quarters and the goadings of hunger, men rise above these tendencies to cruelty to offspring. Yet Martin's parents were not unmindful of the spirit of their child. Often would the weary father kneel reverently at the bedside of his boy and pray aloud with all the warmth of his nature, begging the Lord to remember his little son and endue him with his Spirit.

At a proper age, at great expense of self-denial on the part of his parents, the lad was sent to school, such as the times furnished. The spirit of the pupil and he

nature of the discipline of the times are suggested in the fact, mentioned by Luther himself, that his school-master flogged him fifteen times successively in one forenoon. With such an education he early learned to despise the charms of a merely sensual existence. In addition he learned the catechism, the ten commandments, the Apostle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer, some hymns, some forms of prayer, and some Latin grammar.

At this time the only religious sentiment that was manifested by him was that of the most servile fear; he invariably turned pale at the mention of the name of Jesus Christ, who had been described to him only as an offended judge. Parents should beware what impressions they make upon their children as to the spirit and disposition of Jesus! Many an infidel has been made in the home of Christian parents.

At fourteen, Martin was sent to the Franciscan school at Magdeburg, where he was to support himself, mainly by begging. He had a hard time of it. Hearing of the great privations their son was suffering, his parents decided one year later to send him to Eisenach, where was a celebrated school, and where the family had many relatives. Here, however, Martin was as badly off as before. Many times was he pinched by hunger, and often did he have to beg for food. His custom was to go singing from door to door, until some one would give him a morsel. Many a harsh word did he receive instead of bread. One day he had been repulsed so often that he stood in the public square seriously meditating whether he should not give up school and go back to work with his father in the mines at Mansfeldt. In the midst of his melancholy a door opens behind him, and Ursula, the wife of Con-

rad Cotta, calls him in to have some food. She had noticed him in the church, had been struck by his devotion and by the sweetness of his singing. Conrad is also much pleased with the boy. They heard his story, were drawn toward him, and in a few days made arrangements for him to live with them while he was at school.

This little act of kindness saved Luther from the mines, and secured him for the Reformation. If we knew what possibilities lie in these poor boys about us, we should be less indifferent to them. Ursula thought she had only rescued a little beggar from the streets, when in reality she was helping on the grand Reformation. Reuchlin thought he was only educating a bright son of a poor armorer, when in truth he was training the theologian of the Reformation, Melancthon. Certain scholars thought they were only helping on an Alpine shepherd's lad, when in fact they were training Ulric Zwingle for the Reformation of Switzerland.

With his mind now free from care, he progressed rapidly in his studies. He took rank at the head of his classes, and by his native acuteness and diligence soon outstripped his fellows. In Latin, eloquence, poetry, and music he excelled. Three years pass; Luther is eighteen. He has a burning thirst for knowledge, and longs to enter the University. His father encourages him, but requires him to study law. Accordingly in 1501 he enters the University at Erfurth. Here his genius soon gave him first rank among the students. He was devout and prayerful, after the Romish fashion.

Two years pass; Luther is twenty years old. He is in the University library. He discovers a strange work in Latin. He examines it. *It is the Bible*—the first he had ever seen. He opens and reads. It is the story

of Hannah and the child Samuel. He is overjoyed. "O that I had such a book!" he cried. He went back again and again to read this treasure. *The Reformation principle was in that Book, and it began to dawn upon Luther's mind.*

I.—What was the *principle* which determined the fact and the form of the Reformation? It was the doctrine of justification by faith, as taught in the Word of God. Man is a sinner; his righteousness is as filthy rags; his works count for nothing; he is lost. "No man is justified by the law in the sight of God." Christ has died for us. His righteousness becomes ours by faith. He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned. Faith, then, is the sole condition of salvation. "The just shall live by faith." That is the unimpeachable testimony of the Word. Rome taught differently. Rome built on works of righteousness. She burnt as heretics those who taught the Bible doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ. Whoever saw the true doctrine was necessarily a Reformer. He must oppose and denounce the false teachings of Rome, or be untrue to his convictions. Luther had not attained a knowledge of this doctrine as yet, but he was searching the Scriptures and was destined to come to it. He had found the Bible, in which the Reformation lay hid, and he was ere long to find its secret.

II.—How did the doctrine of justification by faith come to be such a power in the heart and life of Luther? Because it was burned into him by a peculiar and a protracted experience; that is why. First, he had a spell of sickness, which nearly cost him his life, and which occasioned him great uneasiness as to his spiritual condition. Awhile after this he let his sword fall on his

foot and severed an artery, and then nearly bled to death. This alarmed him again. In 1505 he had taken his Master's degree, and was a teacher of philosophy in the University. In teaching moral science he was constantly reminded of his sins, and that he was not pardoned. He resolved to do anything in order to have a good hope of eternal life. One morning he received the news that his most intimate friend, Alexis, had been assassinated. He was greatly agitated and said, "What would become of me, if I were thus called away without warning?" He had gone home for the summer vacation, and as he was returning to Erfurth, he was overtaken by a violent thunder-storm. The lightning flashed terribly, the bolt fell at his feet. He thought his hour had come; he fell upon his knees and vowed before God to devote himself to the Church, if he were spared. But how can he do it? He must be holy. He will enter a monastery. That will save him. That will secure him eternal life.

A few evenings after, he makes a supper and invites his friends. They spend a jolly evening. It is Luther's farewell to the world. Late in the night he announces his purpose to his companions. They are shocked, and try to dissuade him from it. But he is resolute. Nothing can change him. That same night he leaves his clothes and books, quits his lodgings, knocks at the gate of the convent of the hermits of St. Augustine. He asks admittance. The gate opens and closes. Luther is forever separated from his home, from his friends, and from the world. This was August 17, 1505, and Luther was not quite twenty-two.

The learning of this new-made monk exposed him to the envy and jealousy of the ignorant monks about

him. He was made the sexton and the menial servant of the convent. He was compelled to employ his spare time begging in the streets. He was allowed very little time to gratify his passion for study. He fasted, he prayed, he dwindled to a mere skeleton. He was seeking for holiness, but it eluded him. He found a single Bible chained to the wall of the convent; to this he continually resorted. He wanted to know God's will, but his own prejudices blinded his eyes.

John Staupitz, the vicar-general of the Augustinian order, came upon his regular visitation. He saw the hollow-eyed, cadaverous young man. He surmised the trouble. He instructed Luther. He told him to trust in the righteousness of Christ and not in his own works. "If you desire to be converted, do not be curious about all these mortifications and all these tortures. Love him who first loved you." That was the voice of Heaven to Luther. He goes to the chained Bible and finds that Staupitz was right. He finds peace, but it is not perfect. He has fits of despondency. One day he lay in his cell, overwhelmed with despair. A venerable old monk saw him, perceived his trouble, and said, repeating the *Credo*, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." "You must believe not only in the forgiveness of David's and Peter's sins, but of your own as well." The light broke in. Luther believed and was saved.

Luther had been three years in the monastery at Erfurth, when in 1508, at the age of twenty-five, he was called to a professor's chair in the rising University of Wittenberg. That was destined to be the field upon which he would fight his battles. There he began to expound the Scriptures to the students and to sow the seeds of the Reformation. And there he first got the doctrine into definite objective shape. It was



while he was expounding Romans. He came in chap. 1. 17, upon the quotation from Habakkuk, "The just shall live by faith." It strikes him. He ponders it. It grows upon him. Henceforth everything is to receive color from that doctrine.

III.—This brings us to our third question. What was the effect of this doctrine upon Luther's teaching?

1. It led him to exalt the Word of God as the only infallible guide of faith. He saw very plainly that the Romish theory of works was built on the opinions of men, and that it was contradictory to the true Bible theory; therefore, Luther had to decide between the Scriptures and the Church, between God and man. The world knows he decided for God's Word. This decision, however, was not reached in a moment, but was the result of years of devout study of the Bible.

In 1812 he was made Doctor of Divinity in the university and was henceforth required to devote himself to the study of the Bible. He confesses that at this time he had read only small parts of it. Sad comment on the theology of the day! But now he became immersed in the study of the Word, for himself and for others. Besides, he was now preaching to immense crowds with matchless eloquence in the Wittenberg church. Thus while meditating upon the Word, while expounding it to the students, and while preaching it to the people, he was growing into that transforming conviction that, as an authority in matters of faith, everything pales—the fathers, the councils and the Popes—before the Bible. And he was being prepared, too, for the heroic testimony which he afterwards gave to his Rock-founded faith. He was being prepared to defy Popes and Emperors in the name of God. The doctrine of the infallible authority of

Scripture once clearly realized, every future act of the Reformer was determined by it. By the Bible he judged the doctrines of theology, the practices of the Church, the conduct of the Bishops and Priests, the deliverances of the councils, and the authority and acts of the Pope. Justification by faith is the principle of the new life; the Word of God is the rule of its ongoing and its outgoing. Having attained thus much, then other things necessarily followed.

2. Justification by faith reposes all merit in Jesus Christ, and attributes the salvation of the soul wholly to grace, and is therefore opposed to every theory of justification by works. Luther saw this, and it became necessary for him to lift up his voice in criticism and warning. Many a time was his voice heard and his pen used in the fearless defense of Scripture doctrine. But the climax of his teaching on this subject was reached in his Commentary on Galatians, in which he expounded the doctrines with great power, and threw himself with all his learning and logic against the Church doctrine. "Christ gave himself for our sins," he wrote. "It was not silver or gold that he gave for us; it was not a man; it was not all the angels; it was himself that he gave, out of whom there is nothing great. And he gave this inestimable treasure for our sins. Where, now, are those who vaunt of the power of our will; where are all the lessons of moral philosophy; where are the power and the strength of the law? Since our sins were so great that nothing could take them away except a ransom so immeasurable, shall we still claim to obtain righteousness by the strength of our will, by the power of the law, or by the teaching of men? What shall we do with all these artifices, with all these delusions? Alas! we shall cover

our iniquities with a false righteousness, and we shall make hypocrites of ourselves, whom nothing in the world can save."

Luther, however, did not deny the virtue of good works, but only the *saving* virtue attributed to them by the Church of Rome. He showed that men are saved by faith in the Son of God, and that this salvation so transforms them as to make them abound in good works. Good works, therefore, are the out-working of salvation, and not the means of procuring acceptance with God. It would be a grand thing if every sinner realized that the only way to be saved is to throw himself, sins and all, upon the merit and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, truly and trustingly relying upon him and him alone for salvation. And it would be immeasurably profitable if every Christian realized that his faith is not genuinely placed in Jesus Christ unless it brings forth the proper fruit of good works.

- 3. Out of this doctrine of justification by faith grew Luther's indignation at the sale of indulgences. It was when the Reformer hurled his thunderbolts at the indulgences that he made the foundations of Rome to tremble. What were the indulgences? The word has lost its original meaning, except in technical usage. It formerly meant, *favor, remission, forgiveness*, and not license for unlawful acts, as we commonly use it now. In order to be entirely fair in defining the Romish doctrine of indulgences, I will simply quote one of their own authorities, Bishop Gibbons, Bishop of Richmond and Administrator Apostolic of North Carolina. He says, "An Indulgence is simply a remission, in whole or in part, through the superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and his Saints, of the temporal punish-

ment due to God on account of sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted."—*The Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 385. Further along in his book he says, "Now there are two impediments that withhold a man from the heavenly kingdom—sin, and the temporal punishment incurred by it. And the Church, having power to remit the greater obstacle, which is sin, has power also to remove the smaller obstacle, which is the temporal punishment due on account of it."—*Ibid*, p. 386. Certainly, if the Church has power to remit sin, it has the power to remit the penalty of sin; but it has power to do neither. This whole doctrine is a blasphemous Romish assumption. "Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" Who but he can remit the penalty?

Pope Leo X desired to complete the magnificent Church of St. Peter, and, "with that view he issued a Bull promulgating an Indulgence to such as would contribute some voluntary offering towards the erection of the grand cathedral."—*Gibbon*, p. 390. That is, the Pope was out of funds with which to support his extravagances, and he hit on the indulgences as a means of replenishing his coffers. John Tetzel, a Dominican monk, was the distinguished individual who was intrusted with the sale of the indulgences in Germany. "Attended by a numerous retinue, he travelled from place to place, and offered his wares with the most unexampled impudence and obtrusive publicity."—*Kurtz II*, p. 34. He proclaimed, "There is no sin so great that an indulgence cannot remit; and even if any one—which is doubtless impossible—had offered violence to the blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, let him pay—only let him pay well, and all will be forgiven him." The indulgence

diplomas which he issued proclaimed absolution from every sin and every penalty, and affirmed, "If thou shouldest not die for long years, this grace will remain unalterable until thy last hour shall arrive."—D'Aubigne, I, 258. That is, having obtained an indulgence, no past or future sin could ever come between the purchaser and paradise.

Luther felt outraged. He preached against the indulgence hawkers. He went at noon, on Oct. 31, 1517, to the Wittenberg church, and nailed on the door 95 theses against the abominable traffic, thus challenging anybody to defend it. The whole world heard the ringing of his hammer as he drove those tacks. The Reformation in its external form had begun. Its success was assured, for God was in it and his Word was back of it. The next four years were years of terrible strain, and events of momentous significance followed quick upon each other; but, under God, Luther was firm, until at the Diet of Worms the final blow was struck and Rome dismembered. I should like to describe some of those stirring scenes. I should like to write of Luther's fearless conduct before the Pope's legate at Augsburg, in 1518, where he was urged by every means to retract his teachings, but where he maintained his faith, and after several days of conference left the cardinal awed and confused at the master spirit of the great Reformer. I should like to describe the disputation at Leipsic, where the monk of Wittenberg met in debate with John Eck, the Chancellor of Ingolstadt, and one of the subtlest reasoners of the age; and how Luther routed his sophistries at every point, stood loyal to the Word of God, and made many friends for the Reformation. I should like to record how Eck went to Rome, in his

rage and disappointment and procured against Luther the Pope's bull of excommunication, and what fears were incited thereby among Luther's friends, and of his apparent indifference. But I have no space to reproduce history.

4. The doctrine of justification by faith put Luther in pronounced and permanent antagonism to the papal hierarchy. This great doctrine admitted no forgiveness except by Jesus Christ, no salvation except by his grace, no authority for faith except his Word. Thus the authority and prerogatives of the Pope were set aside. The Pope was only a man; he was not the vicar of God. He had no power to forgive sins. He was a usurper; he was anti-Christ. Luther's eyes were gradually opened to see this. The primacy of the Pope was an important part of the great debate between Eck and the Reformer at Leipsic. Eck contended that Leo X was Pope by divine right; Luther denied this. For five days they debated this question. Luther brought everything to the Word of God, and showed that Christ alone is sovereign of his people—"King of kings and Lord of lords"—and that he shall reign until all enemies are put under his feet. On the other hand, Eck dodged the Bible and quoted the fathers. In the words of Luther, "The reverend doctor flees from the Scriptures as the Devil before the cross. As for me, with all due respect to the fathers, I prefer the authority of Holy Writ."

Not long after this Luther published his "Appeal to the German Nobility," in which he called upon them to assist the Reformation, and at the same time he denounced the papacy in most eloquent terms. "Hearest thou this," he wrote, "O Pope! not most holy, but most sinful Pope! May God from his throne in heaven

soon hurl thee from thy throne into the bottomless pit." This appeal had a marvellous effect. Thousands of copies were sold in an incredibly brief period. All the world was aroused. The Pope's bull of excommunication was fulminated against the Reformer, but he and his friends burnt the parchment at a public assembly. Meantime thousands were gathering to the standard of the Reformer.

Maximillian died. Charles V was made Emperor. The Diet was convened at Worms to decide upon the future plans of the young ruler. To that Diet the Pope intrusted the disposition of Martin Luther, the arch heretic. His legates were there in force to secure the death of the Reformer. Charles V was himself an enemy of the Reformation. Not one was there to plead the cause of Luther. It was such an assembly as the world had never seen. Around Charles V were gathered two hundred and four distinguished princes, dukes, electors, archbishops, bishops and papal nuncios. Around them, in the great hall, were over five thousand men of lesser rank and of no rank. Before that august assembly Luther was brought. His health was such that he was barely able to reach Worms. But there he is alone. As he enters the great hall, the celebrated George of Freundsberg, a grand old general who had seen many a bard battle, tapped him on the shoulder, and shaking his head said, "Little monk, little monk, thou art now going to make a nobler stand than I or any other captain have ever made in the bloodiest of our battles; but if thy cause is just, and thou art sure of it, go forward in God's name and fear nothing. God will not forsake thee!" The old warrior could not help admiring and wishing success to the hero of so many intellectual and spiritual battles. Luther stands before



his majesty, Charles V., and the great throng about him; a man of middle stature, and so thin that his bones may be counted. He is pale from excitement, but perfectly self-possessed. Every eye of the vast assembly was fixed upon the frail man who had yet been strong enough to shake Christendom. Before him was a pile of books. The titles were read, and he was asked if they were his. In a low but resonant voice he answered, "Yes." "Do you retract all that you have said in them?" "That is an important question. Give me time that I may answer without offending God." He is given one day. The next day, Thursday, April 18th, 1521, after the candles are lighted, Luther is again brought before the great assize. The question is again put, "Do you retract?" In answer he described the nature of his writings and explained why he could not retract. He was pressed to give a plain yes or no. The taunt roused his blood. His full, brave self was in his reply. "I will give you such an answer," said he, "Popes have erred and councils have erred. Prove to me out of Scripture that I am wrong, and I submit. Till then my conscience binds me. *Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me. Amen.*" The assembly was thunderstruck. It was hard not to admire the grand man who stood before them, willing to give his life for the truth. The last link which united the church with the papacy was broken. Henceforth the true Church and the Pope are twain. The Reformation goes on with mighty strides, and the success of Luther's work is before our eyes to-day. By a strange providence, which we cannot here take time to describe, he was preserved from death, was permitted to see the assured success of the Reformation, was married and raised up a family for God, and at Eisleben, the place

of his birth, at the age of 63, without any particular previous illness, he fell peacefully and happily asleep in the Lord Feb. 18th, 1546. Thus passed away the grandest man that has lived since the days of Paul.

As we look back upon that wonderful man and his grand work for God, there are many lessons forced upon us ; but I would have you remember this one—the only true principle of reform, now as then, is justification by faith in God's Son. For ages the world has tried to reform men by the doctrine of salvation by good works, and men have become worse instead of better. The only way to change men's lives is to have them depend trustingly and solely upon Jesus. That brings them into relations with omnipotence. Then they have power. If you want to reform men lead them to Christ. If you want to be reformed, believe on Christ.

W. H. BLACK.

HEATHEN AND CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY.

---

THE philosophy of the human mind transcends all others in importance and interest. Psychology reveals the laws of thought, feeling and volition. It is a science of facts and phenomena.

By some writers the term psychology is made to include a historical account of the mental faculties and susceptibilities as they are found to exist in the different tribes of the human family. The high eminence on which this science rests, wears the glow of celestial sunshine, and the other sciences converge toward it as if wishing to catch something of its richness, beauty and splendor. In the light of her countenance, let us contrast those sitting in heathen darkness and those under the divine effulgence of Christianity. Let us not consider externals merely, but also the *inward principles* of man's psychical nature, making inquiries as to his sentiments, sympathies, feelings and inclinations—fountains from which flow all the actions of man.

What great diversities do we find among the races? Look upon some brilliant scene in our own country, as some deliberative assembly, where intellect is vigorous and hearts are aglow for the public good; or, witness the coronation of a monarch, “the installation of St. Louis on the throne of his ancestors, surrounded by an august assembly of peers, and barons, and mitred abbots, anointed from the cruse of sacred oil brought by an angel to ratify the divine privilege of kings,” and a thousand other scenes not less calculated to excite our admiration, and to exalt our opinions of our

fellow-men. Next, behold some savage tribe of the West engaged in wild harangue and dance around their forest fires, rending the air with hideous music. Observe the lean and hungry Bushman as he "crouches in silence like a beast of prey;" or the roaming, sun-burnt Mongolian, resembling in color his own soil "brightened by the saffron flowers of the iris and tulip." Again, in South America you may observe predatory bands of savages, dwelling like beasts in their rocky retreats and the fastnesses of mountain and forest. Next, behold the heathen mother on the banks of the Ganges, as she gives her innocent child to the flowing river. Penetrate the deep forests of Australia, and there behold human forms—"the squalid companions of kangaroos, crawling in procession in imitation of quadrupeds."

What of psychological phenomena do you find in common, if indeed you find more similarities than those merely physiological? If any, are these mental developments similar, or allied to each other? One thing we find in common among the races—*thinking*. Not only does man *think*, but he also *expresses* his thoughts, and that not by motions and signs merely, as brutes, but by spoken and written language. This is nearly universal. Language itself is a product of human mind. Differences in the richness, beauty and eloquence of languages are owing to differences in the refinement and culture of the mind. We get an insight into the Greek mind through Grecian literature. But there are other psychological phenomena which we find peculiar to the different races of men, and which enable us to distinguish the habits and actions of men, both in their external lives and in "their inward nature and originating principles of action."

1. In all ages and in all countries men have always had a profound *respect for the dead*. It is owing to a tender love and sacred esteem which man has for his fellow-man. At the loss of a friend, deep grief—an *instinctive emotion*—irrepressibly rises in the soul on account of its bereavement. The strength of previous attachment is tested. “A sacredness and dignity invest the character and life when once the angel Death has set his seal upon them.” From the remote periods of antiquity to the present time, the rites of burial have been interwoven with, and consecrated by the ceremonies of *religion*. These vary as nations and religions vary. Three modes of burial have been practiced among men, (1,) mummification, (2,) cineration, (3,) interment. The first was practiced from the early dawn of history till the sixth century of the Christian era. With such religious and scientific care did the professional adepts of ancient Egypt embalm the bodies of the dead that they were preserved for many thousand years. Whether among Jews, Mohammedans, Brahmins, or Christians, you will find funeral processions, hear enlogies pronounced and dirges sung. Confucius, born 552 B. C., a political genius, the greatest moral light that ever shone upon the Chinese Empire, had a profound reverence for, and a strong devotion to the rites of burial. Dr. Cunnyngnam tells us that after being greatly perplexed about the burial of his father and mother, Confucius at last buried them side by side, raising a tumulus of earth over them, saying, “I must have something by which I can remember them.” He wept bitterly when he fell down saying, “Ah, they did not so bury the dead in ancient times.” Only behold the graves of primeval patriarchs, the sarcophagi of Palestine, the magnificent tombs of the kings, the

mausoleums of Europe, the monuments of America, and the "innumerable tumuli over all the regions of the world." What are these but memorials of the dead? Pass within the vast sepulchers of the Theban mountains, through the massive corridors and galleries, to the place where the bodies of kings and queens are enshrined, "deep within the earth in a mass of masonry, far from the stir of the living world," a place fit enough, in its beautiful sublimity, for a mansion of the dead. Just opposite Cairo, on the western bank of the Nile, the great pyramids loom up before us, "glittering white against the blue sky." Herodotus tells us that the Egyptians consider the pyramids as an emblem of human life. At any rate, the pyramids were used as the sepulchres of kings. It is not necessary, in order to learn that men have a profound respect for the dead, to visit the morgues of Paris, or the catacombs of Rome. Evidence is found in every land, whether heathen or Christian. When the savage warrior lays himself down to repose, his companions assemble around him, and with sacred regard pay their last honors to their sleeping hero. Thus, there is sung by humanity a continual requiem of sublimity and sadness, and our earth holds on her swift, silent way around the sun, bearing in her bosom the last remains of fathers, mothers, children and friends.

2. In all ages of the world we find men embracing the doctrine of the *immortality of the soul*. It has obtained the consent of all nations. The soul, with its vast capacities and deathless aspirings, must have an existence when its earthly career has ended. The heathen sage exclaims, "I hope to go hence to good men." The wife of Achilles gave her body to the flames in order that her soul might be with that of her

husband in the land of immortal spirits. The ancient Chinese would not dare to move the bodies of the dead, for that would also disturb the rest and quiet of the soul. Many of the North American Indians once believed in metempsychosis—a doctrine advocated by Pythagoras, and which prevails to a considerable extent in India and China at the present day. North American Indians believe, according to Loskiel, that “Indians can not die eternally; for even Indian corn is vivified and rises again.” The general belief among them is, that the souls of the good go to the land of pleasure; those of the wicked to the land of melancholy. Native Greenlanders believe in an endless future existence. They have an Elysium in the deep abysses of the ocean, where dwells the Great Spirit, Torngarsuk. They believe in future rewards and punishments, future happiness and misery. We are told that the idea of *annihilation* is a horror to the Esquimaux mind. It has been said that Hottentots have no idea of a future state. Yet those who have acquainted themselves with their notions and beliefs tell us that they not only believe in the soul’s immortality, but they even offer up prayers to the good Hottentots departed. The inhabitants of Guinea believe that the soul is immortal, and that it will either be happy for ever, or be damned to endless woe. African chiefs say that God takes their souls at death, and most of the African tribes believe in a state of retribution.

“Whence this secret dread and inward horror  
Of falling into nought?

Whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,  
This longing after immortality?”

This sentiment is common to the race. Where the light of the Bible had never been, this overmastering



sentiment has been found. In heathen lands, as well as in Christian lands, it has stimulated men to lofty deeds of patriotism, self-sacrifice, and devotion to religious duty. In all times and in all lands human minds have taken up this "Problem of the Ages," and as a result all communities, tribes, nations and tongues proclaim in concert, "There is a life beyond the grave." All of this proves the *similarity* of the opinions, conceptions, and sentiments of the vastly different races of men, at least upon one subject. God made no failure when he undertook to make man in his image and after his likeness.

3. It would be difficult to find a tribe of men upon the globe but had some *conception of a deity*. The idea of a Supreme Being is graven upon the human mind. It must be intuitive. Everywhere you go man is influenced in thought, deed and action, by the unseen, or by the supernatural or superhuman. Men universally look up to some mysterious Being whom they regard with awe and veneration. Whence the origin of religious ideas? I say by a divine revelation. For nothing else can account for so many prevailing sentiments among men, and for so much *similarity* in religious thought. Prof. Max Müller irreverently asks, "How did man know that there are gods?" He answers in ridicule, "Because the gods themselves told him so." Such the query, such the answer in his lecture "on the origin and growth of religion," delivered in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey. It was simply a stroke under cover at the idea of a divine revelation. While the heathen deity does not in reality reveal himself, yet the heathen worshipper embraces an idea which, indeed, is a fundamental idea in an enlightened Christian theology. As a Christian, I know

that God exists, because he has *revealed* himself to me in his works, and through Jesus Christ, his Son.

In the theosophy of the Hindüs, Brahm is the eternal, self-consistent, divine cause and essence of the universe, "who is the soul of all being, and whom no being can comprehend." He is the "eternal, uncreated being, the original and mighty one." There are three periods of Hindüism, the Vedic, the Epic and the Puranic. During the Vedic period, the Hindüs looked upon the mysterious phenomena of nature as manifestations of their divinity. Dyo was the light; Indra the bright firmament; Surya the sun; Agni fire and lightning which came from heaven, consumed the sacrifice, carried up prayers to the other gods, became the priest of gods and the god of priests. Brahma was Creator; Vishnu was Preserver, and Siva, the third in the Hindü triad, was the *destroyer* and *renewer*. From the Zend-Avesta, the Zoroastrian scriptures, it has been found that the ancient Persians worshipped Ahuro-Mazdao, "the creator of the earthly and spiritual life, the lord of the whole universe, at whose hands are all the creatures." He was the father and creator of truth and good-minded things. He was wisdom and intellect, bestowing immortality and rewards upon the good, and punishing the wicked. The Persians finally changed his name to "Zervana Akarana"—uncreated time, the infinite one. Their mediator was Sraosha, the sincere, the beautiful, the true. An incarnate angel, a teacher and prophet, he showed men the way to heaven, and pronounced judgment on human action after death. He never slumbers. With drawn sword he guards the whole world after sunset. His palace is decorated with stars. He walks, teaching religion, round about the world. The

god of the Egyptians, was Athyr, the *original night*, or the *concealed ground of all things*. The native races of America worshipped the great and good Spirit. He was literally the creator of heaven and earth, of men and brutes. He was almighty, kindly disposed to men, wishing them to do good. Some believed that the abode of the good Spirit was above the blue sky, and that the milky way led up to it. They offered up sacrifice in order to appease the wrath of the good Spirit, and fasted in order to purify themselves from guilt. Speaking of the North American Indian, Schoolcraft, formerly an Indian agent, says: "Mistaken in his belief in a system of gods of the elements, wrong in his conceptions of the social duties of his life, and doubly wrong in his notions of death and eternity, he yet approves himself to the best sensibilities of the human heart, by those strong ties which bind a father to his children, and link whole forest communities in the indissoluble bonds of brotherhood. He lingers with affection, but helpless ignorance, around the dying couch of his relatives; and his long memory of the dead ceases but with life itself. No costly tomb or cenotaph marks his place of burial, but he visits that spot with the silent majesty of grief. God has implanted in his heart affections and feelings which only require to be moulded, and directed to noble aims. That *impress seals him as brother*—erring, indeed, and benighted in his ways, but still a brother." Greenlanders worship the great Spirit. They hardly regard him as a creator. Yet the more intelligent portion of this hyperborean people believe in the doctrine of the original cause. One of their philosophers reasons thus: No man can make a bird. It must have proceeded from its parents, and they from their parents;

but they must have had some first parents--whence did they come? Certainly there is a being able to make them and all other things—a being infinitely wise. Hottentots worship *Gounya Tekquoa*, the supreme power, the God of all gods, living beyond the moon. The god of the inhabitants of Western Africa is powerful, beneficent, the maker of the world and men. He is the thunder, and he punishes the wicked with his bolts. In another section in Africa they worship a creator through a mediator, and curse only by Didi, their devil. They never take the name of their god in vain. (A capital idea.)

Now we may ask the question, why is the heathen conception of a heathen deity formed, so far as we know, without the aid of Christianity or the Bible, so closely allied to the Christian's conception of the true God, formed with their aid? This is a hard question. (a) One answer may be that "the intuitive conception of deity may be regarded as a divine revelation, made directly to the *individual*." (b) Another, that God saw fit to make revelations to representative men, such as Confucius, Zoroaster, Mohammed and Socrates, suitable to the age and people. See *U. P. Quarterly* Jan. 1880, p. 18. (c) Because, (as Dr. Miller says in same number of the *Quarterly*, p. 85,) "in its power to know, to will, to plan, to execute, the finite human mind is like to the infinite divine mind." Dr. Porter says, "The rational methods of the divine and the human intellect must be the same." And Kepler once exclaimed, "O God! I think thy thoughts after thee." I think the best explanation will be found in the nature and constitution of the mind, and in the laws of human thought. If this be so, then the common origin of the races will be proved.

4. Some very important features of this subject may be found in *religious worship and prayers*. The mind of man is, in this nature, reverent. Go where you will and you will find dignified and exalted intellect bowing in reverence to Deity. Why do we find such a disposition in the heathen as well as in the Christian mind? Why does the heathen mind aspire after something to worship? Surely God must have *implanted* these desires and aspirations in the soul of man. Deity appears to all men, heathen or Christian, as *perfect* in all the attributes of his being. It is an instinctive principle, an impulse of his nature, a law of his soul which directs man to lift up his soul to his object of worship in adoration, praise and communion. There is no degradation too deep for the uplifting of a prayer. "He who never worships, has, in reality, no religion—knows no God." Many and mysterious are the rites of religious worship, and the modes by which men approach Deity. Some make peculiar sacrifices, immolate themselves or sacrifice their children in order to obtain favor and blessing. When the Greeks were about to embark for Troy, Agamemnon offered his own daughter as a sacrifice in order to appease the wrath of Artemis, and to obtain her favor and assistance. The Greeks would perform heroic acts, and then use them as arguments in their prayers to the gods for blessings. Often they would engage some divinity to *intercede* for them, as when Achilles prevailed on silver-footed Thetis to plead his cause before Jupiter. How often does the Hindü mother offer her child as a sacrifice to the gods! The Delaware Indians offered sacrifices in order to pacify their Deity. The daily prayer of an Amina Negro is: "O God, I know thee not, but thou knowest me; thy assistance is necessary

unto me." The morning prayer of the Sember is: "O God, help us; we do not know whether we shall live to-morrow; we are in thy hand." These are heathen prayers, but somehow they have the right ring. These must be natural wants of the soul. Every morning, in the kingdom of Issini, the native folds his hands and whispers softly this prayer, "My God, give me this day rice and yams, give me gold and aigris, give me slaves and riches, and give me health." The inhabitants of Guinea have sacred groves, which none dare enter save the priests. Their prayers refer to their bodies, health, good weather, rich harvests, and victory over their enemies. Similar sentiments are found in Hindü prayers. In heathen prayers comparatively little is found expressing repentance and sorrow for sin. The idea of man's dependence on supernatural agency has forced itself upon the human mind. "The way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." When Bryses, the priest of Apollo, offered his sacrifice and prayer for redress and for vengeance upon the Greeks, the "savor of the sacrifice went up toward heaven, twining itself around the smoke." In John's apocalyptic vision, "another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand."

W. P. BONE.

## HEBREW ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

“By the Constitution of a country,” says Paley, “is meant so much of its law as relates to the designation and form of the legislature, the rights and functions of the several parts of the legislative body, and the construction, office and jurisdiction of the courts of justice.”

The origin of the British Constitution is so ancient, that when any historian, without long, close and patient study, attempts to delineate it, he finds himself grossly in darkness. We Americans, who can point at every letter, word and sentence of our Constitution—a thing of the present—pause with wonder before that mighty British structure, which has been freedom’s bulwark for many long centuries, and yet of which no line has ever been written upon paper or parchment, nor yet engraved upon wood, or metal, or stone. It is, in some sense, like “the underwritten and sure laws of the gods, that were not born to-day or yesterday, but live forever, and no man knows whence they came,” of which Sophocles speaks.

But we think we *do* know whence they came, just as surely as a botanist knows whence come the flowers from Alpine heights, although he never saw the place from which they sprang.

From “the days whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary,” the people of England have been governed by their unwritten Constitution. It has always answered the purpose, always been found to be



the protector of the weak, and the ultimate conqueror of the despotic. It has from early ages been composed of Lords and Commons. Hume asserts that the first meeting of the House of Commons took place in 1265, called together by the powerful Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. But Lord George Lyttelton, who devoted nearly all his maturer years to writing the history of Henry II, differs entirely with his learned predecessor on this subject. Hume's History of England was published some ten or twelve years previous to Lyttelton's Henry II. As Lyttelton did not attempt the history of a nation, but of a single reign, and his patient, laborious study of years being given to this one period in English history, we may expect more accuracy and research, than from any historian whose labors cover the whole field of English history. He was, moreover remarkable as one of the most unprejudiced and impartial of writers. Pope complimented him in his youth, in these lines:

Free as young Lyttelton his cause pursues,  
Still true to virtue and as warm as true.

In answer to Hume's assertion, that previous to 1265 the House of Commons did not exist, he says: "I can not discover, in the history of those times, any reason sufficient to render it probable that so great an alteration should then have been made in the English Constitution. Such an alteration must have produced disputes between the nobility and people. But there is not the slightest allusion by the writers of that age to any such change. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that the legislative body was unchanged from the earliest ages of the Saxon government."

Sir James Tyrrell, whose history of England, in five volumes, was published in 1704, was an indefatigable

searcher after old records, and he quotes a writ dated the fifteenth year of Edward II, which sets forth a claim of certain tenants in ancient demesne, that they ought not to be charged with wages to knights of the shire, "forasmuch as they and their ancestors had, from time beyond memory, always been exempted from the expenses of knights sent by the community of their country to the Parliament of the king and of his royal progenitors." As Edward the II ascended the throne in 1307, and as this writ was issued only fifty-seven years from the time fixed by Hume as that in which knights appeared for the first time in Parliament, how can we understand these expressions, "they and their ancestors had, from *time beyond memory*," and, "the king and *his royal progenitors*?" According to the usual course of human events, some of the members of the Parliament of 1265 were living at the time this writ appeared. A "time beyond memory" is defined by the law books to mean the time preceding the reign of Richard I, 1189.

A statute of the fifth year of Richard II (1377) runs thus: "All and singular persons and commonalties, which from henceforth shall have the summons of the parliament, shall come, henceforth, to the parliaments in the manner they are bound to do, and *have been accustomed within the realm of England of old times*. And if any person of said realm, which from henceforth shall have the said summons—be he archbishop, bishop, prior, duke, earl, baron, ban, banneret, *knight of the shire, citizen of city, burgess of borough*, or other singular person or commonalty—do absent himself, &c., he shall be amerced and otherwise punished, *according as of old times hath used to be done*, within the said realm in the said case." These three

last mentioned individuals—*knight of the shire, citizen of city, burgess of borough*—were members of the House of Commons; and if this House had been organized for the first time in 1265, the repeated allusions to the “usages of old times” would have been entirely inapplicable.

Still another proof is adduced by those Englishmen who do not agree with Mr. Hume on the origin of the House of Commons. A writ of summons, directed to the sheriffs of Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, requiring two knights to be sent from each of those counties, is extant in the roll of the thirty-eighth year of Henry III. This proves, beyond question, that the usual allotment of knights (two from each county) were sent to Parliament in 1254, eleven years previous to the period fixed by Mr. Hume. The Lords being assistants and counsellors to the king, and the Commons being the representatives of the people, shows that this division of parliamentary duties was of ancient date; probably originating in the time of Alfred the Great, as it is the period pointed out, both by history and tradition, as the period of great and beneficent political changes.

Sir Francis Palgrave believed that the Commons had place in the English Parliament at a very early period.

Supposing, as we do, that Alfred changed the Wit-anagemot (which he found a rude and unwieldy assemblage of Saxon chieftains) into the two bodies similar to the legislative Hebrew bodies—of, first, Lords or counsellors of the king; second, Commons or representatives of the people—we understand why the nation, as they evidently did, regarded this part of the government as of divine origin, and were never willing to change it. Laws received from the Bible would be naturally held

by a piously disposed people to be something sacred, and "no body thought of altering or abolishing them, any more than he would think of abolishing the laws of nature." Therefore all their legislation tended to the conservation rather than the improvement of the law; it affected to be not law-making but only law-declaring. This character is traceable nearly throughout the whole course of English literature, and in the early periods is very strongly marked. "The legislative power of the court of Parliament was exercised unconsciously, because it resulted from the remedial power. Complaints arose of the violation of the law—of neglect of the law. The monarch promised to forbid the abuse, and further remedies were provided in defence of the existing law. Its principles of equity and justice receive a new and more solemn sanction. Remedial and declaratory statutes thus succeeded to older remedial and declaratory statutes; yet Parliament, echoing the sentiments if not the words of the barons of Merton, scarcely ever intended to introduce a new law or to enact a new statute."—*Edinburg Review*, vol. 36, p. 306.

Matthew Paris, when he mentions the "capitula" or rough draft of the great charter, delivered by John to the barons, says that the articles thereof "were partly written before in the charter of Henry I, and partly taken out of the ancient laws of Edward the Confessor." And the charter of Henry I, still older, was said to be, in some respects, more advantageous to liberty than Magna Charta itself. The barons were very powerful in 1265, and it is scarcely credible that they would have been willing to associate with themselves a House of Commons, and thus dispossess themselves of a great part of their authority. At any rate, if any such

change had been made, the historians of that day must surely have recorded it. That they did not is proof positive that no such radical change was then made. On the contrary, the statutes and the writs, as we have shown, gave decided evidence that no changes had been made for a long period of time.

William the Conqueror, notwithstanding the fact that he had gained England by conquest, took the usual coronation oath of the English kings. The oath was administered by an English archbishop, Aldred, of York. He bound himself to maintain the Constitution and existing laws of England, and in the fourth year of his reign confirmed the same in Parliament. In one of the statutes enacted by him, he declared "that all the freemen in this realm should hold and enjoy their landed possessions, free from all unjust exactions and from all tollage; so that nothing should be enacted or taken from them but their free service, which they, by right, owed to the crown, and were bound to perform." It is further said in the statutes, "that this was ordained and granted to them as an hereditary right forever *by the common council of the kingdom*," which very remarkable statute is justly styled by a learned author, "the first Magna Charta of the Normans," and it extended no less to the English than to the Norman.

Notwithstanding these rights accorded to the people, William often acted as if his own tyrannical will was the only law of the nation. He introduced the feudal system into England, and under it the Saxon freeman, known as *ceorls*, rapidly degenerated into Norman *villeins*. But the spirit of freedom, engendered in their souls by the laws and institutions of Alfred the Great, never died out. They still maintained

their neighborhood courts, and governed themselves in the main, but were obliged to submit to many acts of oppression on the part of the king and his powerful Lords. The Normans, however, had many noble traits of character; they were a shrewd and highly intellectual race, and saw, with admiring wonder and keen appreciation, the beauty and wisdom of the Saxon political system, which had been organized by Alfred. Sir James McIntosh says, "The Norman historians, who seem to have had this note book and diaries in their hands, chose Alfred as the glory of the land which had become their own." Since Alfred's days there never has been a time in English history when free-thinking on political and religious subjects has been quite suppressed. "Of all the great nations in Europe, England alone has succeeded in reaching a high state of civilization, without seriously modifying her free institutions. The great puzzle of nation-making has been, how to secure concentrated action on a grand scale, without sacrificing the principle of local self-government. The political failure of ancient Greece was the failure to secure concerted action on a sufficiently large scale. Rome succeeded in securing concert of action, but in so doing, sacrificed to a great extent, the principle of local self-government. The Roman government came to be a close corporation, administering the affairs of the government through perfects and sub-perfects; and when we say that the Teutonic invasion infused new life into Roman Europe, I suppose that we chiefly mean that the Germans reintroduced, to some extent, the "town-meeting principle," and strengthened the "sense of local and personal independence"—*John Fiske*. When Charles the Simple inquired of the Northmen, what

title their leader bore, they replied, "None, we are all freemen."

But their freedom was not the enlightened and consolidated freedom which Alfred's pious adoption of the Hebrew system secured to the English. He taught them the Hebrew system of representative government; a mode of representation far more perfect than that of our day. All of Alfred's graduated courts, from that of the "primordial political cell," the tithing, up to the general reservoir, the House of Commons, were representative assemblies. J. R. Green, in his "History of the English People," says: "If we regard the shire courts as lineally the decendants of our earliest English Witanagemotes, we may justly claim the principle of parliamentary representation as among the oldest of our institutions." But I cannot think the shire courts older than the courts of hundred and the courts of the tithing. With them originated the system of representative government in England; but it was not new even at that time; it was as old as the Hebrew commonwealth. The house of lords was not a representative body; it was composed of the assistants and counselors of the chief magistrate, the king. Greece and Rome, with all their learning, art, power, and civilization, knew nothing of representative government. They had no Bible instructed leader, like Alfred, to put them on the right track. Even Christian Rome in effect discarded the Old Testament, the only portion of the Bible in which political laws were found. It almost seemed as if their hatred of the Jews had become so intense that they rejected the authority of the Old Testament, simply because the Jews acknowledged it.

The most important part of the constitution of England, was the organization of her courts of justice—the



tithing, the hundred, the shire. A tithing was a community of ten families. The tithing had a municipal government of its own and managed its own affairs. These courts were subordinate one to another, so that from the decision of that of the tithing there lay an appeal to that of the hundred, and from that of the hundred to that of the shire. Lord Bacon says that Alfred found this model of government in the Pentateuch. It was copied from the tens, hundreds, and thousands of the Hebrew republic. He does not add that the Parliament (not *called* Parliament, however, until the reign of the Normans) was modelled after the same divine pattern, but my reasons for thinking so are as follows: Henry de Bracton, one of the itinerant judges in the reign of Henry III, appointed in 1244, wrote a book (in Latin) on the Constitution and laws of England, and in it states that in his day the Lords were the counsellors of the crown; they were "*consules, a consulendo; reges enim tales sibi associant ad consulendum.*"

This was precisely the office of the Hebrew Senate. They were appointed for the express purpose of assisting the chief magistrate to govern, because his duties were too heavy to be borne alone. Moses complained that his burden was greater than he could sustain. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy of the elders of the people (whom thou knowest to be elders of the people and officers over them), and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone."—Numbers, 11th chap. The House of Commons was simply "the people" (or folks, as the Saxon term was), represented by their elected deputies, the "rulers of thousands." The divine warrant for their office was this: "Take (elect)

ye wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, men of truth and hating covetousness, and I (your chief magistrate) will make them rulers over you, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, and rulers of ten." "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man, for the judgment is of God. And the cause that is too hard for you, *bring it unto me*, and I (your chief magistrate of his deputies) will hear it." Never before was such a system invented; never before was so much wisdom expressed in so few words.

The Levites were the professional class, constituting lawyers, preachers, teachers, doctors and writers. The divine mandate for their institution was, "And the sons of Levi shall come near, and by their word shall every stroke of every controversy be tried." In the Saxon courts an ecclesiastic was always required to be present, and his duty was probably to explain the law, as the ancient Levites did. But the Normans changed this. "Courts for ecclesiastical jurisdiction were, for the first time, established by the Conqueror, the bishops being forbidden for the future to sit as heretofore with laymen in the county and other civil courts. Attorneys or agents for the management of causes at law are first mentioned after the conquest."—*Pictorial History of England*, vol. 1, p. 555. One of the sayings attributed to King Alfred is this: "Englishmen should forever remain as free as their own thoughts."

The word town, as used by our Saxon ancestors, conveyed a different meaning from what it now does. Tithings, towns and villages had the same signification in law. The whole country, as before stated, were divided into tithings or townships. "No township," says

Sir Francis Palgrave, "was without a *gerefa*, elected by the people themselves. The township constituted, in every case, a community by itself, having a jurisdiction and legislative power of its own. It was represented in the monthly courts of the hundred and half-yearly courts of the shire by the *gerefa* and four other good and lawful men. Each township had also the keeping of its own police. When a crime was committed the inhabitants were required to raise the hue-and-cry, and were bound to enforce the appearance of the criminal to take his trial."

Blackstone becomes very eloquent when he describes the changes effected by Alfred the Great in the political construction of England. He says: "His mighty genius prompted him to undertake a most great and necessary work—no less than to new-model the Constitution, to rebuild it on a plan that should endure for ages, and out of its old discordant materials, which were heaped upon each other in vast and rude irregularity, to form one uniform and connected whole. This he effected by reducing the whole kingdom under one regular and gradual subordination of government, wherein each man was answerable to his immediate superior for his own conduct and that of his nearest neighbors; for to him we owe that master-piece of judicial polity, the sub-division of England into tithings and hundreds, if not into counties; all under the influence and administration of one supreme magistrate, the king, in whom, as in a general reservoir, all the executive authority of the law was lodged, and from whom justice was dispersed to every part of the nation by distinct yet communicating ducts and channels; which wise institution has been preserved for near a thousand years, unchanged from Alfred's to the present time."

Sir John Spelman is equally eulogistic. He says: "So great and sudden a change did Alfred's institution produce in the kingdom, that whereas before there was no travelling without arms, there was soon not only safe passage, but all places became so secure that when the king (for experiment's sake) caused golden bracelets to be hung up in the cross-roads, they seemed to deride the passengers, for no man durst lay his hands on them. Women might safely travel anywhere alone." "Nay," said Ingulphus, "if one left his money all night in the highway, he might come the next morning and be sure to find it safe and untouched."

H. M. IRWIN.

EDITORIAL.

---

It is needless to recount the reasons why the REVIEW has changed ownership. These have been fully set forth in the Church papers. It is sufficient to say that the change was made not only with the knowledge and unanimous consent of the theological faculty of Cumberland University, but with their equally unanimous pledge of the heartiest co-operation. Only upon these conditions would the transfer have been made.

It is proper to state that this issue of the REVIEW has been delayed by circumstances connected with the transfer. Hereafter, unless some unavoidable delay occurs, it will be issued in good time.

It is too soon to say just what the readers of the REVIEW may expect as to the course to be pursued. They may rest assured, however, that it will not be a backward movement, if the periodical be given anything like an adequate support. Its success in more ways than one will depend upon the degree to which it is patronized. It is hoped that every one who has heretofore given this enterprise encouragement will continue to do so, and will endeavor also to interest others in it. A little help from a large number will make it possible for the REVIEW to do a great work—a work that can be done in no other way.

It may be stated further as to the policy to be pursued, that it is desired and designed to make the REVIEW more decidedly a review than it has been heretofore. As far as possible, whatever is freshest and best in human thought on divine things will be put before

its readers. While the list of contributors who have done valiant service will be retained, it is hoped that the pens of others will be engaged in enriching these pages. While issued more especially as denominational literature, a truly catholic spirit will be continued, and help gladly received from any quarter. Each writer will be responsible for his own views; but at the same time nothing harmful to the real interests of the kingdom of Christ will be given a place. The field to be cultivated is a wide one—and one, too, in which many changes occur. Truth is eternal; but the expressions thereof undergo many mutations. Old beliefs are dropped for new ones, or are put into new settings with the development of knowledge. Hence, there is room for and need of much charity. The truth must at last prevail. Whatever may be gleaned from science, art, philosophy, or revelation, that will help on the kingdom of God and of his Christ will receive a hearty, welcome in these pages.

It is with pleasure the announcement is made that Rev. S. G. Burney, D.D., Rev. A. B. Miller, D.D., and Rev. A. J. McGlumphy, D.D., have consented to become contributing editors. These brethren need no introduction to the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. They have been prominent for years as educators, and are known as men of piety and learning.

The editor wishes to thank his contributors for their articles, and many friends for their encouragement. With temerity and prayer he ventures upon this work, believing that the hand of the Lord is in it. He craves the sympathy, prayers, and co-operation of all.

LITERARY NOTICES.

---

LECTURES ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS, by the Rev. William Graham, D.D., of Bonn, Prussia, author of "The Spirit of Love;" "On Spiritualizing Scripture," "The Jordan and the Rhine," etc.

This book bears indubitable evidence of the diligent study of the Scriptures, and indicates that its author bows submissively to their authority, and looks to them alone for his belief. He is a pre-millennialist, and gives faithful exposition of "that blessed hope." It is, however, designed more especially to set forth the present exalted privileges of believers. From the author's preface we take the following, which gives a clear intimation of what the book is: "Assurance of salvation is nearly banished from our churches, the doctrine of Christ's Headship is only faintly asserted, the hope of the coming and kingdom of the Redeemer is darkened, and, generally speaking, our Christianity is not that happy, unhesitating, victorious power of God in the soul which in the days of the apostles and our martyred fathers shed over the believing church such brightness and glory. The cure for all this is our realized standing in the risen Head. We died in his death, we rose with him from the grave, and now, as believers, we are seated with him in the heavenly places. We look, not from earth to heaven, but, according to our epistle, we look down from heaven to earth. We are in Christ, and from his heavenly throne we contemplate the vanities of this passing world. I confess it, then, one main design of this work is to enable thee to realize more clearly thy relations to the Lord and Redeemer of his



Church. For this end I have felt the Epistle very helpful to myself, in taking me out of the shallows of modern experiences and theological common-places into the deep, pure ocean of divine grace and love. May God make it a blessing to many." We feel unable too highly to commend this book, for it has been not only a great privilege to peruse its pages, but it has also been a great blessing. We hope our readers will obtain the book, for it is worthy a prominent place in the library. It is well printed, in large clear type, and on good paper; is neatly and well bound, and is a handsome volume. Address the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, Pa.

R.

ECCE COELUM; OR, PARISH ASTRONOMY, by a "Connecticut Pastor," is now in its twentieth edition, and we would be glad to see it go to its one hundredth in the near future.

Not many pastors can succeed in a course of lectures to their people, taking astronomy as their subject. Most of them would be dry, and to the ordinary parish audience uninteresting. The book before us is made up of six lectures, and every one of them is full of important truths and valuable suggestions. The first is a preparatory lecture, in which the author discusses the uses, history, and instruments of investigation. The subject of the second, is the Sky; the third, the Satellite Systems; the fourth, the Planet Systems; the fifth, Higher Systems; and the sixth, the Author of Nature, as related to the leading features of Astronomy. We would like to say more of this good book, for it is indeed worthy of praise, but our space will not permit. We heartily recommend it to our readers. It is a good

book for our children, and those who read it will be apt to strive to know more of this wonderful science, and its careful and thoughtful study will beget respect, admiration, and love for him whose glory "the heavens declare," and whose handiwork the "firmament sheweth." Send to the American Tract Society and get it.

K.

---

A CRITIQUE OF DESIGN-ARGUMENTS—A historical review and free examination of the methods of reasoning in Natural Theology. By L. E. Hicks, Professor of Geology in Denison University, Granville, Ohio. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

We have not space to give a *critique* of the work before us, or even the notice it deserves, for a *critical* notice would be pleasant and profitable, at least to us. We can, therefore, only call the attention of our readers to this *new* book of history and criticism. Our author has undertaken a big task, and has done a good work. He reviews the history of Natural Theology, at least its outline, and while we may not accept his "conclusions," we are thankful for his "facts." As he says, his "work does not constitute an exhaustive Bibliograph of Natural Theology, but it supplies considerable material for one." If any of our readers contemplate writing on Natural Theology they may learn much in this work of their predecessors. A large portion of the work, as is indicated by the title, is devoted to criticism of the work of the past in this department of Theology. In this part of the work, while he is metaphysical and scientific in his discussions, he is also sufficiently popular in style to interest the general reader. He proposes two "sorts of reasoning" in physico-theology, and marks out their precise bounda-

ries, and the distinctions and differences which separate them—the argument *from order*, and the argument *from ends*. To do this he must have a name, the companion of *teleology*, and he coins *eutaxiology*. While he is not the first to find an argument *from order*, he has given it a name and established it in its place. He dislikes the term “final cause,” and argues that it should be dispensed with altogether. He reviews Thomas Aquinas, and others of the Middle Ages, yes, back to Socrates, Cicero, Plato, Galen and others, on the natural theology of the Greeks and Romans, on down to the design and final causes of Darwin and Janet.

We will stretch this out to a long notice, or rather it will stretch itself, unless we stop abruptly. We have not found a more readable book upon scientific subjects, and it is not only valuable in argument, but in facts which are full of interest to the students of theological history and criticism. It is a neat book, well bound in cloth, of 417 large octavo pages. K.

---

WE are indebted to Harper & Brothers for “A History of Classical Greek Literature,” by Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, M.A., Prof. of Ancient History, Trinity College, Dublin. The first volume treats of the Poets, and the second of the Prose Writers. Its design is to furnish a *resume* of Greek literature for the unclassical reader. It is a convenient reference book for those who have not the time or inclination to pursue a classical course.

---

MORNING THOUGHTS FOR OUR DAUGHTERS is a helpful book of devotional reading, by Mrs. S. G. Reaney, published by the American Tract Society.

It is intended especially as a book for daily use by school girls, but gives much valuable instruction suitable for all who are trying to live a Christian life.

---

FROM the same we have just received a novel, "Cluny Mac Pherson; or, a Tale of Brothely Love," from the pen of Mrs. Amelia E. Barr. We have not had the time as yet to read it, but the name of the author and the fact that it is sent out by the Tract Society is sufficient guarantee of its worth. The scene is laid in Scotland, which gives it additional interest.

---

AMONG the many good books sent forth by the same Society, we have recently received one written by Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D., "Wayside Springs from the Fountain of Life." It is truly what its title would indicate—a spring of the water of life, of which, "if a man drinks he shall never thirst." A.

GENERAL NOTES.

---

THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.—The Bible is the rule of faith. It is to be interpreted in accordance with the analogy of faith. This analogy is the substance of doctrine found in the plainest passages of Scripture. This was the view of the Reformers. But the scholiasts substituted for this *internal* rule of faith, an *external* rule of faith—first in the apostles' creed, then in the symbols of the churches, and finally in the Reformed or Lutheran or Anglican systems of doctrine. And thus the Scriptures became the slaves of dogmatic *a priori* systems. The evangelical interpreter returns to the position of the Reformers. He has learned in the history of doctrine that the early church depended too much upon the apostle John, the mediæval church upon Peter and James, the modern church on the apostle Paul. He finds a system of theology in the Bible itself, which he has learned as a Biblical Theology to be carefully distinguished from Dogmatic Theology. He has found that Peter and John, and James and Paul were all disciples of Jesus Christ, and have in him their center and life. The evangelical interpreter has learned that the Old Testament is an organic whole, in which priests and prophets, sages and poets find their center and life in the theophanies of Jehovah. He has learned that Jehovah and Jesus are one, and that in the Messiah of prophecy and history the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, become an organic whole. With this bringing forth of the internal substance of the Scriptures in its unity and

variety, theological exposition finds its satisfaction and delight, and the analogy of faith is harmonized with the principles of interpretation, which have indeed prepared the way for its advance and achievements.—*From Briggs' Biblical Study.*

---

EXPERIENCE.—We have very often in life principles presented to us in theory—in the head, as it were—but not in the heart. These are rarely deep, clear, full, and of force. They are shallow. But when principles have gone down into the heart, and been drawn out into action, they give an experience that is of immense value to men. I am afflicted, suppose, with some disease. Here is a man who tells of some remedy which he is certain will cure me. I ask him if he has known many cases of recovery. No, he replies, for he has not yet had any applicants. I ask him if he knows anything of physiology, anatomy, chemistry, the pharmacopœia, &c. No, he answers; but he is sure I ought to take his medicine, as it is the thing that will suit me. I remind him that a few days ago he was complaining of what now afflicts me, and I inquire if he has applied his own remedies. No, he answers again, but asserts that I should take it, as it is the very thing for me. Somewhat suspiciously I tell him to try it upon himself first, and then come and give me the benefit of his experience. Theory is a very good thing, but it is theory steeped in experience that becomes of value to men.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is principles in the heart, principles steeped in feelings, principles reduced to the test of practical life, that are as deep as water for man. In a parched land

where mere theory dries up all things, where mere speculation withers every opening flower of feeling, it is the man with an experience, like a deep well, that has a blessing for his fellow men. How all this applies to the gospel of Jesus, to the truths of the Bible, to the power of Christianity, is plain enough. Jesus came to show us the path of life by walking in it. His servants came to preach a gospel which had first saved their own souls. We defend a Christianity that has borne every conceivable test it is possible to apply to it. Every man, therefore, who knows it is a man more or less of deep experience—an experience going deeper than technical life, trade life, scholarly life, or life in any of the phases outside the gospel of Jesus Christ.—*Rev. Robert Mitchell, in Evangelical Repository for December.*

---

COMMENTARIES.—But what is the commentary for? When? As often as there is need. How? By complementing and supplementing the knowledge of common sense, of which the ordinary Bible student is supposed to be possessed. There is a use of commentaries which is worthy of consideration. Study the portion of Scripture *first* without assistance. Read it carefully, examining every word, if possible, in the original, at least in the translation. Read it a second time, marking the relation which exists between the sentences and parts of sentences. A third reading will throw much additional light upon the matter in hand. Now note those words or phrases which you do not seem perfectly to comprehend. And again, those words and phrases of the meaning of which you can obtain no satisfactory idea.

There are three elements, (1) that which you seem



to understand; or (2) that which is more or less doubtful; (3) that which is entirely uncertain as to meaning. Now, but not until now, refer to the commentary, and see what solutions or explanations are suggested for these points of greatest difficulty. Weigh the views that are presented, and decide, with the light that you have, *i. e.* in view of all the circumstances, upon that which is the most satisfactory. Examine the remarks touching the questions which were partly but not entirely understood. Finally, read over whatever else may be said in the commentary, and note everything suggested, which did not occur to you. If you have several commentaries, pursue the same method. Use them (1) to solve difficulties which you could not be expected to solve; (2) to throw light upon that which is more or less doubtful; (3) to suggest that of which you might not have thought. *Use commentaries, but do not abuse them.—Old Testament Student.*

---

THE FIRST SIN.—The narrative of the first sin, too, has not only a consistency that grows on the contemplation, but offers the only solution of the dim traditions of the past. It has been not uncommon to question the fitness of the prohibition as a test of obedience, as though out of keeping with the magnitude of the occasion. But a moment's reflection shows that not only could the principle of a genuine obedience be tested as well in that mode as any other, but what is more important, that some such method was the only one in keeping with the circumstances of the narrative, and further yet, the only method practicable in those simplest conditions of early life. All the complicated relations of advanced civilization and even of society

were wanting. Here were two persons in a garden of nature. Fraud, theft, adultery, arson, robbery, were impossible, murder as yet inconceivable, all overt acts of cruelty, if not impossible, yet without a possible motive. What other form of test could or can well be devised than just such as that adopted, standing thus related to their *actual life and condition*. To a profounder reflection, it carries on its face the stamp of verisimilitude, and these more striking devices which the objection would require, would in their inconsistency, brand the narrative as untrue. And while, in some aspects, mystery must hang over any speculation on the modes of the first human sin, our narrative offers perhaps all the help than can be given when it traces the source of the seduction to an *outer* influence, distinctly explained in the New Testament, (Rev. XII, 9; xx, 2; John VIII, 44,) as "that old serpent which is called the Devil, and Satan," and when it couples with the persuasions of the appetite the specious inducement of a higher good—"ye shall be as gods"—and a pressure applied to the more emotional of the pair. And while the real agent is the identified with Satan, I see—in accordance with a narrative which described all *as it appeared*—no fair mode of escaping from the recognition of the actual objective appearance of a serpent, chosen for the reason suggested in the narrative, the subtlety of the movement that comes and goes so stealthily and so unexpectedly, and the associations thereby awakened. The one grave objection, that this is the concession of a miraculous transaction for the purpose of deception, is perhaps sufficiently answered by saying that to them it was no miracle—for there was no adequate knowledge of a settled course of nature—but an ordinary phenomenon.

I stand the more firmly by this view, from the striking confirmation which is found in the ancient and wide-spread traditions of the east, pointing definitely to precisely such a transaction. We not only find the sacred tree that gave immortality—the Indian Kalpanksham, the Persian Hom, the Arab Zuba, the Greek Lotus, the tree in the coffin at Warka, and Babylon, named “the place of the tree of life,” (Geikie, “Hours With the Bible,” pp. 1167); we also find the ruin of the race connected with the eating from a tree, in the Edda of the north, in the Zendavesta, and in the legend of Thibet, and a deceiver also appears, who is in some cases the serpent (Ib. p. 119). Indeed, the serpent figures largely in traditions, in Egypt, Chaldea, Persia, Phenicia, and elsewhere, as the enemy of the gods.

The confirmation becomes more definite and singular still. We find not only a Babylonian cylinder of the 9th century B. C., showing the sacred tree with attendant figures and eagle-headed guardians, and another cylinder showing the sacred tree with “attendant cherubim;” but we find another early Babylonian cylinder with sacred tree showing fruit, a seated human figure on each side, each with a hand extended toward it, and a serpent behind the one whose hand is nearest to the fruit (Smith’s “Chaldaische Genesis,” ed. Friedrich Delitzsch, pp. 98, 87); a vase from Cyprus of the 6th or 7th century B. C. (now in the Metropolitan Museum of N. Y.), from the branches of which hang two large clusters of fruit, while a great serpent approaches and prepares to seize one of them with his mouth; a famous sarcophagus in the Capitoline Museum shows, near Titan, son of Japetus, who performs his work as moulder or designer, a man and woman standing nude

at the foot of a tree from which the man makes the gesture of gathering the fruit; a bas-relief laid in the wall of the garden of Villa. Albani at Rome presents the same group, with a serpent twined around the trunk of the tree under the shade of which the two mortals stand (Lenormant, "Origines," pp. 92-4). All these are the distant echoes of the Scripture record, drawing their significance from that simple story of which the same sacred volume offers also the solution. —From President Bartlett's "*Sources of History in the Pentateuch.*"

DOCTRINAL PREACHING.—The prejudice so common in these days against "*doctrinal* preaching" is a stupid senseless feeling. It has been my good fortune to hear a great number of preachers, distinguished and otherwise. And I can testify that by far the most interesting and effective sermons I have heard might be called "*doctrinal.*" The foundation, the substance, was some important doctrine of the Word, unfolded in the light of revelation, illustrated and applied, by argument, and appeal, and human experience. \* \* \*

If the reader has any doubt on this point, let him *test* the matter for himself. Try, if you have never done it, a new dispensation of things. With the Word and Spirit of God as your sole guide and "help," sit down to a fresh and thorough investigation and study of the "Plan of Salvation." Let alone every "commentary," all human "helps," all human "authorities." Plant your feet hard by the Cross, as the central fact, the central doctrine, and the central force of the system. Look at each essential doctrine and

fact as it stands related to this. Then begin with the beginning of things, the "one Mediator," and trace the divine purpose down through the ages, and through the manifold economies and dispensations, to the end of the world, and to its consummation amid the awful solemnities of the judgment day. Then go back and take up each essential fact and doctrine, and ascertain its true place in the system and its relations to it as a whole. Then study history, sacred and profane, and the great book of Providence, and draw on your reading for illustrations and confirmations. And when you have mastered the grand theme, as far as the limitation of human thought and your circumstances will allow, give yourself, for weeks and months and years if necessary, under the full inspiration of such an investigation, to the work of careful, earnest, thorough preparation of a series of sermons, essentially embracing the whole supernatural scheme, combining the highest forms of the doctrinal with the intensest and widest application of the practical. And having done this to the best of your ability, and in the spirit of an overmastering loyalty to the truth, and to the souls committed to your charge, *preach* them to your people on successive Sabbaths, with all the boldness, and freshness, and power, and urgency, which the mastery of your theme is sure to inspire, as well as with prayer for the promised agency of the Holy Spirit to make the truth effectual. Do this, and *sure* I am, you will be surprised at the *results*; not only upon your people, in reviving interest, in edifying the household of faith, and in rousing sinners from their indifference and death-stupor; but equally surprised at its effect upon *yourself*, both immediate and future.—*From Sherwood's "History of the Cross."*

DESTRUCTION OF THE CANAANITES.—God evidently regarded it as indispensable to the great objects which he designated to accomplish through the instrumentality of the children of Israel, that they should be separated as completely as possible from the rest of mankind, and be to him a peculiar people. This rigorous sequestration under which he placed them, as we now understand, was for the purpose of educating them, during what St. Paul calls their childhood and minority, in preparation for the advent of their promised Messiah, and the gospel dispensation; in other words, that the germs of divine truth which God had planted in the soil of Abraham and his seed might be protected and cherished as in an enclosed nursery, until they should take firm root, and grow up into a tree of life which the wild and brutal nations—the *goim*, or heathen—should not be able to uproot nor cut down.

This separation of Israel from the heathen, being thus indispensable to the accomplishment of the divine purposes of grace and salvation, must be accepted with all its necessary consequences, which are very numerous and of great significance. For, among them, we have the command given through Moses to exterminate the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, which has always been felt as one of the greatest moral difficulties of the Old Testament. This command was delivered in such words as the following: “When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee . . . and when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly consume them—thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them.” . . . The Israelites themselves were threatened with similar de-

struction if they should fail to execute these terrible injunctions: "But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you, then . . . it shall come to pass that I shall do unto you as I thought to do unto them." Hence their zeal in this work of indiscriminate slaughter, of which we have abundant evidence: "And Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord and said: If thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, then I will utterly destroy their cities. And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites, and they utterly destroyed them and their cities. . . Joshua drew not his hand back, wherewith he stretched out his spear, until he had utterly destroyed the inhabitants of Ai. They utterly destroyed all that was in the city [of Jericho] both men and women, young and old. . . We . . . utterly destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones, of every city."

Now the difficulty here is, not whether it was right on the part of God thus to exterminate, root and branch, a people whose cup of iniquity was full to overflowing. Of this there can be no question with any who believe in a divine providence. For these nations, like Sodom and Gomorrah, Pompeii and Herculaneum, were utterly destroyed under his providential government and ordering of human events. But the difficulty is this: how the giving of such commands to his mortal creatures—how his requiring of them to slay without pity such multitudes of his fellow creatures, including of necessity the aged and infirm, parents and children, nursing mothers and infants at the breast, women with child and in their travail sorrows—how all this is to be reconciled with the character of God as revealed in Christ, and especially with the law of love to our



enemies, and pity for the feeble and suffering. Nor do we write for those, if any such there be, who cannot feel that there is any difficulty here.

Here, then, we frankly concede that it may not be possible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give a solution of this difficulty which shall be perfectly satisfactory. For we are surrounded with mysteries in the providence of God which no created mind can fathom. But it affords us some relief when we consider, that this destruction of the Canaanites was a solemn judicial act, on the part of God, upon a people whose moral corruptions were such that their continued existence in the world could no longer be tolerated; and that the Israelites were simply his instruments for the execution of this judgment, and were abundantly instructed so to regard themselves. Also it is a further relief when we consider what has been already suggested, that all this was a necessary consequence of that separation of the covenant people from the corrupting influence of the heathen which God had ordained as indispensable to their success in making preparation for the coming of Christ, and for the blessings of the gospel. In fact, its justification is placed by God himself upon this ground, where he says: "Thou shalt consume all the people. . . . They shalt not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee to sin against me; for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee." And so it proved in all their subsequent history, so far as they failed, as partly they did, to execute this judgment upon the heathen inhabitants of the land. At the same time we must not forget that the highest and purest laws of morality had not yet been revealed, nor could be, as is proved by the fact that they were not, until the time should come when this

outward sequestration of the covenant people should cease. Hence, the commands which were given them upon this subject, as upon all others, had to be accommodated to the degree of moral light which they were capable of receiving, and could not go beyond it. This whole transaction, therefore, is to be regarded as belonging to a low moral condition in the people; nor is it conceivable that God should give any such commands now to those who have been enlightened by the gospel: "the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth."

But in order to understand more fully how the people of those times could give themselves up, without misgiving and so heartily as they did, to that indiscriminate slaughter, we must apply to the fact of their separation from the heathen those words of St. Paul, which have been cited in another connection: "Moses put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." For they remind us that, in this case as in the preceding, the lawgiver could not tell his people, and if he had told them they could not have received it, that this separation was a temporary arrangement; that the partition wall between Jew and Gentile, which God himself had built up, was destined to be broken down. The gospel truth, that the Gentiles were to be fellow-heirs with Israel in the great salvation, could not be revealed to the people of the old dispensation whilst the necessity of keeping up the separation between them continued. It is true they had glimpses and adumbrations of it, as in the promises to Abraham that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blest, which were more fully unfolded by the later prophets; but these fore-shadowings, though clear enough to us from the light

of the gospel and from the history of their fulfillment, were not understood by the people of those times, nor, is it safe to say, was it intended that they should be. For if it had been, that would have effectually broken down this partition wall before it had ceased to be indispensable for the protection of the infant church.

\* \* \* \* \*

Since, then, it was necessary that the great truth should be veiled from the people, whilst they were under the law, all other revelations, as in the former case, had to be conformed to their ignorance on this point. Hence, the evangelical command to go forth and disciple all nations, could not be given to the church of the old dispensation. It was no part of her duty to "preach the gospel to every creature." To her the gospel itself was very imperfectly revealed. It is true that some evangelical light—twilight rays from the Sun of righteousness to herald the brightness of his rising—did fall from time to time upon the minds of the prophets, and enable them to anticipate, in a manner, that God would gather unto himself a people out of the whole world. But as the prophets were understood by St. Paul, they did not foresee "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs of the same body" with the covenant people—that the distinction between them should be done away. And whilst it was necessary that this distinction should be kept up, no communication from God on other points, with respect to his character, attributes, purposes, or providence, could be allowed to withdraw this veil which Moses had put over his face. God could not be represented to his chosen and particular people as the God of other nations in the same sense in which he was their God, or, if that expression be too strong, as bearing those

relations to all men which are brought out in the New Testament. Other nations must needs be spoken of as in some sort aliens and outcasts, as the enemies of God and his people.

Now in consequence of this necessary veiling of the truth upon this point from the people who slaughtered the Canaanites, they did not and could not feel towards other nations as we are instructed and required to feel by the Lord and his apostles. In their eyes, as a matter of necessity no less than of fact, the uncircumcised heathen, whom they were commanded to destroy, were an unclean, impure and abominable seed, whom it was a pious and godly work to exterminate, root and branch, from the earth. And the command which God gave them to do so must be understood as accommodated to their low moral condition, yet as high as they were capable of receiving in consistency with the paramount necessity of keeping them separate from the heathen.—*From McIlvaine's "Wisdom of Holy Scripture."*

---

THE LORD'S SUPPER AND THE ATONEMENT.—The ordinance of the Lord's Supper is an emblematical ordinance. "It is," says Matthew Henry, "a parable to the eye; and in it God uses similtudes" ("The Communicant's Companion," chap. i. §1). Not only is it an emblematical ordinance, it is emblematical of a specific thing, and it is in fact "a miniature picture of the leading truths of Christianity." (This is the expression of Dr. Brown in his preface to Matthew Henry's "Communicant's Companion," p. 12, ed. 1831.) It is indeed the whole gospel in an emblem. It is a declaration to the eye, and to the touch, and to the taste,

that Christ's body was broken for our sins, and his blood shed for our iniquities. Our partaking of the Lord's Supper is again, on our part, "an emblematical expression of a state of mind and of heart" (Dr. Brown, "Preface," p. 19), in accordance with the truths emblematically exhibited in the elements. It is symbolical of our belief in the gospel. If it be true that it is the gospel, or "the truth as it is in Jesus," that is in the Lord's Supper exhibited in a symbol, it must also be true that there is nothing shadowed forth in that ordinance which it is not the duty of every man to believe. It is the duty of every man to believe the gospel, and there is, as we have seen, nothing more nor less nor else than the gospel represented in the "broken bread and the poured out wine." We have there, as it were, in after-type, the gospel, the whole gospel, and nothing but the gospel. What, then, is the gospel which is exhibited in the ordinance of the Supper? We shall have a proper answer to this question when we discover what it is that the partaker of the Supper is bound to believe in the reception of the elements. He is not bound or warranted to believe anything that is not expressly taught in the ordinance itself. He is, however, warranted and bound to believe that "Christ's body was broken for *him*, and that Christ's blood was shed for *him*." The symbolical language of the elements is, "This is Christ's body broken for *you*, this is Christ's blood shed for *you*" (I. Cor. xi, 24, 25), and if the communicant do not echo back that language by saying in his heart, "Yes it is true, this is Christ's body broken for *me*, this is Christ's blood shed for *me*," his participation of the Supper is a mental contradiction of the testimony of the elements. Now,

there is not one gospel for believers and another for unbelievers. There is not one gospel for communicants and another for the world without. By no means. There is but one gospel, and it has but one voice, and that voice tells all, without exception, the same truth. If then the thing signified in the Supper be *the gospel*, and if this emblematical gospel tells the communicant that "Christ's body was broken for *him*, and that Christ's blood was shed for *him*," and if there be not two gospels, and therefore no other gospel than this, the one gospel tells, and must tell, the same good news about Christ to all, viz: "That Christ's body was broken for *all*, and that Christ's blood was shed for *all*." If this is not the case, it must be something else than the gospel or "the leading truths of our religion" that is symbolized in the Supper.

The distinction between believers and the world is not to be found in anything that the elements emblematically say; it is to be found, and found alone, in what the communicants emblematically say in reference to the elements. They profess their belief in the testimony of the elements. They say, "Yes, it is true; the elements are truthful; Christ's body was broken for *us*; his blood was shed for *us*; and this is not true because we are Christians, but we are Christians because we believe this to be true." . . .

Much mysticism has prevailed about the nature of the Lord's Supper, and multitudes seem never to dream that the grand benefit they are to derive from it is to be drawn from the great cardinal truths of the gospel which it embodies and represents. They expect some sudden illapses of illumination or feeling—some private intimation of an interest in Christ not made known to them in the Bible, or in the ordinance itself; and they



never seem to hear the elements themselves most sweetly whispering to their souls, "*This, Christ's body, was broken for YOU; this, Christ's blood, was shed for YOU.*" Nothing of value, however, can be got out of the ordinance that God has not unalterably put in it, and put in it for all times and for all partakers. We have seen that it is THE GOSPEL which God has put in it; and as "the gospel" speaks one language to "every creature" under heaven, it must be the case that it makes known to all that Christ's body was broken for them, and Christ's blood shed for them. \* \*

I would again argue the universality of the propitiation from the immense difficulty of getting into Christ by faith on any other principle. If a man do not believe that "Christ's body was broken for *him*, and that Christ's blood was shed for *him*," he believes nothing that can stop the mouth of an accusing conscience, or fill him with enlightened peace upon his death bed. If a man do not believe that "Christ's body was broken for him, and that Christ's blood was shed for him," he is not qualified to sit down at the Lord's table on earth, far less to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. If Christ's body, however, was broken and his blood shed only for a limited number, how can a man come to know that it was "broken for *him*, and shed for *him*," unless he be furnished previously with a little private Bible to reveal to him his election. I see not by what other way he could come to discern the blessed fact. One thing I know, I can say for myself, "that Christ's body was broken for me, and that Christ's blood was shed for me." This I can say with assurance, but this I can say only because I see it plainly declared in the Scriptures, that his body was in the same sense broken



for all others, and his blood shed for all others. I could not get into "the joy of salvation," nay, I could not find a cleft to let my little finger in, if my Bible were plundered of such words as *all*, and *every*, and *the whole world*. If any man can find out any other way unto Christ, I would thank him to let me know it.

It will not do to tell me merely that "I must believe." I cannot put faith into exercise without an object. I must have something testified to me in order to believe. What, then, is that something that I am to believe? Is it that Christ came into the world to save some sinners? I always believed that, and never doubted it. Is it that he came into the world to save sinners indefinitely? The word "indefinitely" only hides the meaning intended, and my mind cannot rest satisfied till I know whether or not I may consider myself included among the definite number. If I may consider myself included, it can only be because I see that all others are taken in; and if all others be taken in, then Christ came into the world to save all sinners. If, however, I be not warranted to rest assured that I am amongst the indefinite number he came to save, then I must believe merely that he came into the world to save some; and this I never denied or doubted during the whole term of my unbelief and misery. What then, am I to believe and be verily persuaded of, which it is impossible to believe and yet remain "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity?" Let a man who denies the unlimited propitiation tell me, if he can.—*From Morison's "Extent of the Atonement."*

---

EUTAXIOLOGY.—The fundamental proposition of eutaxiology is, that order and harmony are marks of

intelligence. They imply that there has been a pre-conceived plan, to which the phenomena in question have been made to conform. Let us take an illustration from the animal kingdom. Here eutaxiology takes the special form of morphology, or the doctrine of typical forms; that is, morphology is one of its phases, though not the only one. The orderly series of animals grouped into classes, orders, and genera, is another phase of eutaxiology; but we will draw upon morphology at present for an illustration.

In the sub-kingdom vertebrata the morphological type of a limb is, that there shall be first a *single* bone (*humerus* or *femur*), then *two* bones side by side (*radius* and *ulna* or *tibia* and *fibula*), then a number of small bones (wrist or ankle), then *five* bones side by side (*metacarpus* or *metatarsus*), and finally *five* digits (fingers and toes). This type, though not universal among vertebrated animals, prevails so widely, and is so often realized in different animals which are otherwise extremely unlike, that naturalists have no hesitation in accepting it as a type, and describing its elements with all the minuteness and confidence which belong to the description of real things. Is it not, then, a real thing? Not in the sense of being material; it is simply an *idea*, nothing more and nothing less. But an idea which has moulded the form of the hand with which you hold this book, and the wing of a bat, and the paw of a lion, and a thousand other animal forms, all on the same pentamerous pattern, is considerable of an idea. It is quite a real fact if it is not a material object. Call it a creation-idea or an evolution-idea, whichever you like best. An idea it is at all events—a veritable *plan* which only an intelligent being could have conceived and executed.

The key-note of entaxiology is *plan*, as that of teleology is *purpose*. "Plans and Purposes in Nature" would be a comprehensive title for a treatise on physico-theology.

The elements of the eutaxiological proof, or the fundamental conceptions involved in it, are (1) the fact of order in nature, (2) the plan or the mental conception of that disposition of objects and that movement of forces which constitute order and harmony.

This analysis shows that the eutaxiological is much simpler than the teleological argument. There is no such reduplication of the elements, and they are clearly distinct and different; so that there is not the same danger of confounding similar elements as in teleology. Eutaxiology is certainly simpler, but is it as forcible? I shall not at present attempt to answer this question in full. The critical estimation of both these arguments will be undertaken after I have given a historical review of natural theology, and after that estimate will be the time to institute the comparison.

But without such careful examination, judging simply by what lies upon the surface, it would seem that this argument is at least equal to the other in effectiveness. Moreover, it is probable that a considerable part of the energy supposed to belong to teleology has really come from eutaxiology, seeing that they have always been lumped together under the head of *design*. When Napoleon, in reply to the fine-spun theories of the French atheists, pointed to the heavens and said, "But who made all these things?" his argument was eutaxiological, and there is no question but that it was forcible. It was a shot quite as solid as any which teleology can forge. The order, harmony, and beauty of the heavens speak a clear and universal language.

"Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." The burden of their mighty song is the existence of a creative Intelligence. There is no thought of their utility, of an end for which they exist—no complex relations of means and ends to be reasoned out before we can receive their sublime message. The lesson they teach is as simple as it is grand; and the argument based upon it is so plain that neither bungling advocates nor captious critics can easily throw it into confusion.—*From Hicks' "Critique of Design-Arguments."*





## PUBLISHER'S DEPARTMENT.

**T**HERE are on hand a number of UNBOUND volumes of the REVIEW for the years 1880, 1881, 1882, and 1883. These volumes are valuable, and increase in value with the years. Circumstances, however, make it desirable to dispose of them as rapidly as possible. Any one who wishes one or more of these volumes can have them at \$1 each. This is quite a sacrifice to make, and puts these volumes of the REVIEW within easy reach of all. Those who order first will be served first.

Let all those who have not subscribed for the REVIEW do so at once, as it may be impossible in a short time to obtain this number. Only enough copies will be issued from time to time to supply actual subscribers. Those who expect to obtain the entire volume at the close of the year run the risk of failure.

The REVIEW and the ST. LOUIS OBSERVER will be sent to one address for \$3.50. This is a good chance to obtain both at a reduced rate.

In order to aid the subscribers to this periodical, the Publisher makes the following proposition: If forty or more paid-up subscribers wish Dr. C. A. Briggs' recent book "Biblical Study," and will send their names to the Publisher by March 1st, the book will be forwarded to all such for \$1.75 each. It retails for \$2.50. This book of Dr. Briggs is creating much discussion in theological circles, and is a very scholarly work. It is intended to be instructive and helpful to every one who desires to get a thorough knowledge of the Word of God. If the requisite number of subscribers desire the work, let them send their names now and the money when notified. By this plan many Bible students may obtain helpful books who could not otherwise do so. This proposition is open only to those whose subscriptions to the REVIEW are paid up. Address all letters to

W. C. LOGAN,

210 Olive Street,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

T. H. PERRIN.

E. A. SMITH.

—( SHOULD YOU )—

## NEED PRINTING OF ANY KIND,

SEND OR WRITE TO

# PERRIN & SMITH, GENERAL ♦ PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS,

NO. 210 OLIVE STREET,  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

STATE STREET, OPP. THIRD,  
ALTON, ILL.

✂ PAMPHLET, BOOK AND PERIODICAL WORK done at reasonable rates and in a satisfactory manner.

✂ PLAIN AND FANCY PRINTING such as Cards, Programmes, Letter Heads, Note Heads, &c., executed with neatness and dispatch.



# St. Louis Observer,

A WEEKLY RELIGIOUS PAPER,

PUBLISHED IN THE INTEREST OF THE

Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

*It has fresh Church News, vigorous Editorials, excellent Contributions, appropriate Selections for all classes, a Weekly Summary of News, and, in short, all that goes to make up*

**A FIRST-CLASS PAPER.**

TERMS: { \$2.00 per year in advance. Reduction to clubs.  
The OBSERVER and the REVIEW, to one address, for \$3.50.

Address all communications to the

ST. LOUIS OBSERVER CO.,

210 OLIVE STREET, ST. LOUIS, MO.

## Periodicals of the Publication Board OF THE Cumberland Presbyterian Church

### CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN.

Single copy (including postage)..... \$2 00  
To all ministers..... 1 00  
Copy free to any one sending a club of ten. No subscriptions of ministers at the reduced rate (\$1.00) can be counted in a club.

### SABBATH SCHOOL GEM.

Single copy (including postage)..... 50  
In clubs of ten or more to one address... 30  
In clubs of ten per quarter, per copy... 07½

### SUNDAY SCHOOL COMMENTS.

Thirty cents per year, singly or in clubs.  
In clubs of ten or more to one address, per quarter..... 07½

### OUR LAMBS.

Single copy..... 20  
In clubs of ten or more..... 11  
In clubs of ten or more per quarter..... 03

### LESSON LEAVES.

Ten copies and over one year to one address..... 90  
In clubs of ten or more to one address per quarter..... 02½

Address,

**T. M. HURST, Agent,**

NASHVILLE, TENN.

1884.

1884.

## THE TEXAS OBSERVER!

—FOR ONLY—

**\$1 25 TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS!**

We have decided to offer the *Texas Observer* to all new subscribers whose names are sent us with the money, within ninety days from the first of January, for the low price of \$1.25 for twelve months. It is the only paper from which you can learn all about the work of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Texas. It is an eight page weekly containing live communications, editorials, church news, general intelligence and miscellaneous reading. Ministers of the gospel, candidates and licentiates are only charged \$1.00 a year.

Address—

**Rev. J. H. WOFFORD,**

DALLAS, TEXAS.

37-3m